UNITED NATIONS
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Project Implementation Report

(01 July 2022 – 30 June 2023)

Project Title:	**Sustainable industrial production in the cassava and other agro-food sectors through the use of renewable energy applications and low-carbon technologies**
GEF ID:	9468
UNIDO ID:	150434
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	GEF-6
Country(ies)	Côte d'Ivoire
Region:	AFR - Africa
GEF Focal Area:	Climate Change Mitigation (CCM)
Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs[1]:	Not applicable
Stand-alone / Child Project:	Stand alone
Implementing Department/Division:	GLO/SOP
Co-Implementing Agency:	Not applicable
Executing Agency(ies):	UNIDO
Project Type:	Medium-Sized Project (MSP)
Project Duration (months):	36 months
Extension(s):	1 extension
GEF Project Financing:	USD: 863,242
Agency Fee:	USD: 82,008
Co-financing Amount:	USD: 4,000,000
Date of CEO endorsement Approval:	10/27/2018
UNIDO Approval Date:	10/18/2018
Actual Implementation Start Date:	3/15/2019
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2023:	USD 140,014.74
Original Project Completion Date:	3/15/2022
Mid-term Review (MTR) Date:	End 2023
Project Completion Date as reported in FY22:	3/15/2025 a termination was proposed on 31.4.2021 but refused by the government
Current SAP Completion Date:	3/31/2025
Expected Project Completion Date:	3/31/2025
Expected Terminal Evaluation (TE) Date:	1/31/2025
Expected Financial Closure Date:	12/31/2025

UNIDO Project Manager[1]:	Lorence Ansermet

I. Brief description of project and status overview

Project Objective
The project objective is to promote the sustainable industrial production in the agro-food sector through the use of renewable energy applications and low-carbon technologies. In order to achieve this objective, the project will focuse on the following components: i) Strengthening the institutional framework to promote the development of low-carbon technologies in the agro-food value chain ii) Demonstrating the low carbon application in the agro-food value chain iii) Enabling partnerships for replication across the agricultural food-sector iv) Monitoring and Evaluation.

Baseline
Developing countries and emerging economies are increasing their energy consumption for their economic and industrial development. A carbon-intensive industrialization, as observed especially in economies with a large dependency on imported fossil fuels, presents a particular challenge in taking measures against climate change. In Côte d'Ivoire, high dependency on fossil fuels for power generation and lack of clean energy access remain a major challenge in the country's rural areas. According to World Bank and African Development Bank data, currently about 60% of the country's electricity is produced by thermal power stations while 40% is generated by hydropower plants. In its strategic plan 2013-2030 for the development of the electricity sector in Côte d'Ivoire, the Government has identified 66 projects that will require massive investment from the private sector, including through Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) with Independent Power Producers (IPP), to expand power capacity production and to modernize the transport and distribution of electricity throughout the country. Efforts are underway to increase hydroelectric and thermal electricity generation with construction of new hydroelectric dams (such as a 275 MW hydroelectric plant at Soubre) and thermal power plants as well as expansion projects at the CIRPEL and AZITO thermal power plants. In addition, the Government also wants to develop a balanced energy portfolio by encouraging the production of new and renewable energy sources. In terms of barriers, the current policy and legislative framework still needs to be reinforced to actively promote the development of renewable energy and low carbon technologies. Secondary legislation is still missing and to this end the project will develop proposal to enhance the existing framework. Demonstration sites are also missing to pilot the particular approach of applying low carbon technologies in agro-food value chains and showcase the feasibility of PPP business models.

Overall Ratings[2]	**FY22**	**FY23**
Global Environmental Objectives **(GEOs)** / Development Objectives **(DOs)** Rating	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)
A call for manifestation of interest was launched and a selection process of potential private sector partner was established. Technical feasibility analyses were conducted and concrete proposals presented. On this basis, new risks emerge at the technical and economic levels. These risks will have to be dealt with the governmental support in order to secure the replication of the pilot and its environmental impact.		

[1] Person responsible for report content
[2] Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and assure that the indicated ratings correspond to the narrative of the report

Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)
Seven companies responded to the call for manifestation of interest, but further technical analyses leave the project with 1 to 3 candidates which is very few given that the project is seeking partner to commit and invest. The selected sector of cassava is an emerging industrial area which still has to consolidate its market. Therefore, the implementation of the project is slow with moderate expectations.		
Overall Risk Rating	Moderate Risk (M)	Substantial Risk (S)
The risk is Moderate for the project implementation but Moderate to Substantial for its replication rate.		

II. Targeted results and progress to-date

Please describe the progress made in achieving the outputs against key performance indicator's targets in the project's **M&E Plan/Log-Frame at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval**. Please expand the table as needed.

On 21 June 2022, the Director of Cabinet of the Ministry of Environment and UNIDO agreed on the terms and condition to launch a call for manifestation of interest in order to identify private companies processing cassava and interested to establish a pilot unit of energy production with their wastes.
It resumes the project after two years of frozen activities.

Project Strategy	KPIs/Indicators	Target level	Progress to-date
Component 1 – Strengthening of the institutional framework to promote the development of low-carbon technologies in the agro-food value chain Outcome 1: Secondary legislation is reinforced to promote low-carbon development for agro-food value chains, within the overarching policy framework on environmental sustainability			
Output 1.1: National regulatory mechanisms promoting the development of renewable energy systems in agro-food value chains and low carbon technologies are proposed to the government counterpart	Information database for bio-energy potentials in Cote d'Ivoire updated Government commitment to develop a bio-energy roadmap achieved A National Bio-energy Action Plan includes biomass use is put in place	Development and adoption of a "Strategic Bio-energy Roadmap" for Cote d'Ivoire (including social and gender mainstreaming impact section) Elaboration and adoption of a National Bio-energy Action Plan for the year 2020.	No activity during the reporting period
Output 1.2: A sectoral roadmap for improved energy performance in the cassava sector and other relevant sectors is developed	Appropriate policy and regulatory framework for bio-energy development developed and enforced. Biomass utilization guidelines developed and adopted.	Sectoral analysis report presented to the government and validated	No activity during the reporting period

	Bioenergy financing mechanism developed		
Component 2 – Technology demonstration of low-carbon applications in the agro-food value chain Outcome 2: Low carbon technologies are promoted in the agro-industrial processing of agricultural products			
Output 2.1: Feasibility studies consolidated on potential uses of renewable energy in agro-food sectors	No. of technologies adopted for bio-energy project development No. of project investors interested in developing bio-energy projects	Make available Feasibility studies for potential project owners.	5 feasibility studies were undertaken at companies level. 3 proposals are feasible to establish a biodigester to reply to their energy need were tailor made for each companies. Payback periods are between 5 to 8 years.
Output 2.2: Operationalization of an innovative and highly replicable pilot projects	No of visitors at the pilots sites each year No of committed trainees each year	At least two project sites operational	Negotiations will then be carried out during Q4 of 2023 to establish the co-funding of the private sector. Then decision will be submitted to the Steering Committee.
Component 3 – Enabling partnerships in place for replication across the agricultural food-sector			
Outcome 3: Sustainable replication across cassava and other agricultural sub-sectors ensured			
Output 3.1: Sustainable replication across cassava and other agricultural sub-sectors ensured	No of Government Agencies actively supporting the projects	One report with an analysis of other potential agricultural sectors and a roadmap of how to replicate the approach in these sectors	7 companies responded to the call of interest (out of an estimated sector with about 12-to 15 companies in the country). It is not possible to take a one solution fit all companies, which complicates the replication potential. Dialogues with government agencies will take place to seek an agency that could support the project and its replication on a sustainable way.
Output 3.2: Pipeline of bankable projects developed, local capacities established and quality assurance in place	No of commercial banks interested in financing agro related renewable energy project.	At least three project proposals presented to the government for validation	3 bankable projects were developed. Contacts will be taken with potential investors
Component 4 – Monitoring and evaluation Outcome 4: Project's progress towards objectives continuously monitored and evaluated			
Output 4.1: A monitoring and evaluation plan will be prepared and carried out	List of all progress reports prepared and terminal evaluation conducted Gender dimension taken into account: at least 50% of women	M&E Plan ready within 3 months of project start Terminal evaluation completed by end of project closing time Project terminal report completed by end of project	The selection panel was informed and consulted on each step of the feasibility assessment in order to keep a fair and transparent selection process. During Q4 of 2023, the steering committee will be organised in order to decide on the co-funding of the pilot unit

	representation in trainings and it terms of the work force at the project sites on all levels of involvement (manual workers, managers, logistics personnel)	Dissemination materials ready by the end of project	to be established as well as the yearly work plan and budget of the project.

III. Project Risk Management

1. Please indicate the overall project-level risks and the related risk management measures: (i) as identified in the CEO Endorsement document, and (ii) progress to-date. Please expand the table as needed.

	(i) Risks at CEO stage	(i) Risk level FY 22	(i) Risk level FY 23	(i) Mitigation measures	(ii) Progress to-date	New defined risk[5]
1	Low stakeholder involvement on the part of the national government Public sector commitment will be needed to support the replication. (see risk 7)	Low risk (L)	(M)	The project is embedded within the current institutional arrangement in the sector particular within the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Oil and Energy. The creation of a Project Steering Committee will furthermore increase multi-stakeholder ownership and ensure continuity throughout the project duration.	Creation of a selection panel, and a regular dialogue with the Ministry of Environment was established so far. It will be expanded to other ministries such as SME, Industry and energy.	☒ revised
2	Regulatory framework risk: uncertainty in the application of legislation that involves renewable energy production	Modest risk (M)	(M)	Elaboration of a policy document in close consultation with government counterpart to ensure that recommendations are validated and consensus created with respect to the application in national legislation. Especially when it comes to passing the appropriate legislation for private operators to get involved not only in the production but also selling of electricity, revisions need to be made and the project will make suggestions for secondary legislation which are to be validated by the government	Focus was put so far on the practical barriers encounter by the pilot, instead of assessing the entire legal framework.	☐
3	Economic and Sustainability Risk: The risk of raw material supply The project targets the use of post-harvest agricultural waste and by-products and biomass waste generated in	Low risk (L)	(M)	Considering the large potential in existing biomass resources from agro-industrial waste streams, the partial use of these resources is not expected to have any impact on food production. In contrast, the project will promote use of post-harvest agricultural wastes and by-products and biomass wastes generated in production processes, especially in the cassava processing sector.	The project targets the use of post-harvest agricultural waste and by-products and biomass waste generated in production processes, particularly in the	☒ revised

	production processes, particularly in the cassava processing sector. The sector is young but growing, short fall of cassava waste does not represent a high risk, although there is in some cases competition from alternative uses (animal feed). Also, the availability of co-substrates (animal dung) could be a factor limiting scaling up and replication			Sustainable use of modern biomass will be promoted in the project; relevant standards and certification schemes will be applied where necessary. A preliminary study on the sustainability of biomass feedstock for production of electricity was conducted during the PPG phase which clearly states the potential of the cassava feedstock. Another economic risk is the volatility of the oil price which may discourage enterprises from moving away from traditional sources of energy (diesel generators). This aspect was also analysed in the PPG phase to assess the economic viability of biomass energy systems.	cassava processing sector. The supply of co-substrate is priced in the workplans.	
4	Climate change risk	Low risk (L)	(L)	Increased drought periods may affect the availability of biomass resources, both agriculture residues and livestock manure. The design of the project will include climate risk analysis and integrate mitigation strategies. During the project preparation phase, an assessment of the availability of those resources based on different scenarios was be carried out and is to be substantiated during the implementation	The availability of these resources based on different scenarios has been carried out	☐
5	Land use risk	Low risk (L)	No risk	Farmers might be incentivized to change production to cassava instead of other important feedstock in order to benefit from the project. In the project context, this is a marginal issue as there is enough land available around the project sites. It might however become a risk when replicating and upscaling the approach. Close involvement of local authorities will be pursued in order to pre-empt issues related to land-use and also reflect further during the ESMP and when developing replication projects.	Close involvement of local authorities will be sought in order to prevent problems related to land use. So far, the project partners with industry instead of farmers.	☐
6	Economic viability The sector of cassava is fairly new at industrial level in the country and is still consolidating its market. Therefore, it is a fairly risky sector for investors. Consequently, the replication is risky. Furthermore, the market for organic fertilizer – an important by-product of biogas production – is in an early stage of	Medium risk	(M to (H)	Taking into consideration the needed investment, the running and maintenance cost of the energy unit, the price of energy sold publicly is cheaper than the energy from the biomass. It would be challenging to find partners hence making the replication potential difficult.	Detailed financial analysis and work plan were established. It confirmed a payback period between 5 to 8 year without subsidies. The lack of market was integrated in the selection process of companies.	☒ revised

	development. This increases the financial risk for biogas projects				The market for organic fertilisers is being assessed.	
7	Technical risk: Furthermore, technology has to be tailor-made to each company site, availability of co-substrate and energy consumption. Therefore, **the replication** requires some knowledge and support that will have to be provided on a sustainable basis		(M to H	The project will seek the support of a governmental agency that shall get involved at the pilot stage already and take over a support for potential replication.		☒ NEW

2. If the project received a sub-optimal risk rating (H, S) in the previous reporting period, please state the actions taken since then to mitigate the relevant risks and improve the related risk rating.

Technical and economic viability risks are emerging and will have to be taken into consideration in the partnership with the private sector as well as in the support to be provided on a sustainable way for the replication.

3. Please indicate any implication of the **COVID-19** pandemic on the progress of the project.

From July 2022 until June 2023 there were no implication of the COVID-19 on the project.

4. Please clarify if the project is facing delays and is expected to request an **extension**.

The project is prolonged until 31 March 2025. A further potential extension will depend on the implementation of the pilot that has not started yet.

IV Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) & Stakeholder Engagement

IV.1 As part of the requirements for **projects from GEF-6 onwards**, and based on the screening as per the UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP), which category is the project?

☐ Category A project

☐ Category B project

☐ Category C project

(By selecting Category C, I confirm that the E&S risks of the project have not been escalated to Category A or B).

	E&S risk	Mitigation measures undertaken during the reporting period	Monitoring methods and procedures used in the reporting period
(i) Risks identified in ESMP at time of CEO Endorsement	Liquid waste leakage and gas leakage were risk identified	Regular monitoring by the beneficiaries	Monitoring will take place during the implementation phase of the processing unit
(ii) New risks identified during project implementation (if not applicable, please insert 'NA' in each box)	N/A		

V. Stakeholder Engagement

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please provide information on **progress, challenges and outcomes** regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project (based on the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent document submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

So far, all private sector stakeholders that responded to the call for manifestation of interest were committed and interested to understand the technical criteria and options. However, their real commitment will be measurable by their co-funding.

As mentioned above, the public sector will have to show its commitment and engage in the execution of the pilot in order to sustain potential replication. Furthermore, the legal requirement to establish biodigester are more restrictive than to establish a fuel or diesel generator. The engagement of the public sector to establish a conducive framework and support the authorization process is a key factor of success for the project.

2. Please provide any feedback submitted by national counterparts, GEF OFP, co-financiers, and other partners/stakeholders of the project (e.g. private sector, CSOs, NGOs, etc.).

Technical questions were raised to understand the technical constraints to establish a biodigester and its risk: for instance the risk of contamination of the compost if chicken dung is used. The sustainability of the reuse of wastewater within the system, etc. All responses were provided by an international expert to the selection panel.

3. Please provide any **relevant stakeholder consultation** documents.

VI. Gender Mainstreaming

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please report on the **progress** achieved **on implementing gender-responsive measures** and **using gender-sensitive indicators,** as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval (in the project results framework, gender action plan or equivalent),.

The selection of private sector partners is made through a technical analysis of the potential to establish a biodigester. Out of 7 applications, only 1 company was owned by a woman and the company remains among the selected partners.

VII. Knowledge Management

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please elaborate on any **knowledge management activities / products**, as documented at CEO Endorsement / Approval.

A manual of technical feasibility assessment will be finalised.

2. Please list any **relevant knowledge management mechanisms / tools** that the project has generated.

See above stakeholders' consultation documents:

- Report on first feasibility analysis

VIII. Implementation progress

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please provide information on **progress, challenges and outcomes achieved/observed** with regards to project implementation.

Technical feasibilities assessments were undertaken during this year establishing the feasibility and risks of the potential pilots. The following conclusions are made:

Laboratory waste analyses were conducted concluding that cassava waste and its wastewater can produce significant quantities of biogas, enough to cover an important part of the energy needs of cassava processing. However, the use of these wastes for biogas production will require the addition of co-substrates (e.g. animal dung) in order to improve their properties.

- Seven responses to the call for proposal were received. One company had to be eliminated at the first visit because of the weak infrastructure of production, that would require an up-grade, before the production of energy could be considered. One Company was not established in the country yet. **Then 5 feasibility studies were conducted at company level**.
- The space available to set up a digester and the availability of co-substrates were necessary criteria that could not be met by 2 companies.
- Therefore, the project presented detailed proposals of bio-digestor to three companies: it could cover 100% of the needs of the companies in butane gas and between 30% to 90% of their need in electricity. The payback period is between 5 to 8 years.
- The technology proposed is a Continuous Stirred Tank Reactor (CSTR) that offers a high degree of flexibility with respect to different (combinations of) feedstocks. Several suppliers propose different solutions to be put in a bidding.

The challenges for the implementation of the proposed technical solution are the following:

- The market of Attieke is a growing but it is a relatively small market where companies remain of a small size without big economy of scale.
- Investment needed is relatively high and return on investment above 5 years

- Organic fertilizer is not a market yet - Availability of co-substract is a barrier to launch a biogas initiative - Management of biogas unit requires a regular production.

2. Please briefly elaborate on any **minor amendments**[3] to the approved project that may have been introduced during the implementation period or indicate as not applicable (NA).

Please tick each category for which a change has occurred and provide a description of the change in the related textbox. You may attach supporting documentation, as appropriate.

☐	Results Framework	
☐	Components and Cost	
☐	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	
☐	Financial Management	
☐	Implementation Schedule	
☒	Executing Entity	As explained in 2022, the NGO OPEIF Afrique was not selected as executing agency.
☐	Executing Entity Category	
☐	Minor Project Objective Change	
☐	Safeguards	
☐	Risk Analysis	
☐	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	
☐	Co-Financing	
☐	Location of Project Activities	
☐	Others	

3. Please provide progress related to the **financial implementation** of the project.

The project spending concentrated exclusively on technical expertise. Local expertise was used, but without providing the required quality, therefore an international expert was recruited. The co-funding of the private sector will be discussed in the months to come.

IX. Work Plan and Budget

1. Please provide **an updated project work plan and budget** for the remaining duration of the project, as per last approved project extension. Please expand/modify the table as needed.

[3] As described in Annex 9 of the *GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines*, **minor amendments** are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5%.

Outputs by Project Component	2023		2024				2025		GEF Grant Budget Available (US$)
	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	
Component 1 – Strengthening of the institutional framework to promote the development of low-carbon technologies in the agro-food value chain									40,000 $
Outcome 1.1.: Secondary legislation is reinforced to promote low-carbon development for agro-food value chains, within the overarching policy framework on environmental sustainability									
Output 1.1.1.: regulatory mechanisms promoting the development of renewable energy systems in agro-food value chains and low carbon technologies are proposed to the government counterpart									
Activity 1.1.1.1.: contacts with the Government and the EU who are planning to review the framework for energy									
Activity 1.1.1.2.: dialogue with the Government on the project and encountered barriers									
Activity 1.1.1.3.: report and recommendations to the Government									
Output 1.1.2: sectoral roadmap for improved energy performance in the cassava sector and other relevant sectors is developed									
Activity 1.1.2.1.: forum on biomass energy presents the pilot model									
Activity 1.1.2.2.: formulation of road map									
Activity 1.1.2.3.: validation of road map									
Component 2 – Technology demonstration of low-carbon applications in the agro-food value chain									160,000$
Outcome 2.1.: Low carbon technologies are promoted in the agro-industrial processing of agricultural products									
Output 2.1.1.: feasibility studies consolidated on potential uses of renewable energy in agro-food sectors									
Activity 2.1.1.3.: formulation of business plan for the production of energy with partners/beneficiaries									
Activity 2.1.1.4.: identification of investors									
Outcome 2.2.: a viable pilot production site is operationalised, engaging the private sector									385,000$
Output 2.2.1.: operationalisation of an innovative and highly replicable pilot projects									
Activity 2.2.1.1.: planification of the construction									
Activity 2.2.1.2.: budget and work plan validation for the establishment of the energy plant									
Activity 2.2.1.3.: launch, facilitation and follow up of construction site									
Activity 2.2.1.4.: Procurement of equipment									
Activity 2.2.1.5.: production of energy and revision of business model									
Component 3 – Enabling partnerships in place for replication across the agricultural food-sector									149,766$
Outcome 3.1.: sustainable replication across cassava and other agricultural sub-sector ensured									

Output 3.1.1.: mapping of medium-term potential across agro-food sector developed and roadmap for its activation in place									
Activity 3.1.1.1.: revision with the project knowledge of the analysis of the capacity of agro-food sector									
Activity 3.1.1.2.: raising awareness of stakeholders									
Activity 3.1.1.3.: formulation of a potential road map to roll out the model									
Output 3.1.2.: pipeline of bankable projects developed, local capacities established and quality assurance in place									
Activity 3.1.2.1.: formulation of bankable projects in partnership with local entity									
Component 4 - Monitoring and Evaluation									50,000$
Outcome 4.1.: Constant monitoring and evaluation of the progress of the project towards its objectives									
Output 4.1.1.: a monitoring and evaluation plan will be prepared and carried out									
Activity 4.1.1.1.: steering committee takes place									
Activity 4.1.1.2.: A monitoring and evaluation plan is prepared and implemented									
Activity 4.1.1.3.: a final evaluation is carried out									

X. Synergies

1. **Synergies** achieved:

Five fixed dome digesters were installed in the period 2019-2020, under the PRO2M project implemented by FIRCA in order to use the wastewater of cassava transformation to produce gas. None of them is operational. UNIDO technical experts visit some sites, concluding that the technology used of a simple dome biodigester is not appropriate. The wastewater of cassava was analysed to establish its potential to produce biogas. Its result is low but positive, but the used technology is not appropriate.

The project is drawing form the UNIDO experience in Cameroun, Ghana as well as Cambodia. Some further exchange may occur between projects if possible.

3. Stories to be shared (Optional)

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. **Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period.

2. **Responsibility:** The responsibility for preparing the report lies with the project manager in consultation with the division chief and director.

3. **Evaluation:** For the report to be used effectively as a tool for annual self-evaluation, project counterparts need to be fully involved. The (main) counterpart can provide any additional information considered essential, including a simple rating of project progress.

4. **Results-based management**: The annual project/programme progress reports are required by the RBM programme component focal points to obtain information on outcomes observed.

Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) ratings	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yields satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modes overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environmental benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environmental objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Implementation Progress (IP)	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components in not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk ratings	
Risk ratings will access the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than **75%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between **51%** and **75%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks.
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between **26%** and **50%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to **25%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.