



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA.....	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE).....	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	15
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS.....	20
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS).....	23
6. RISKS.....	25
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR).....	28
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	29
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT	30
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING.....	32
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	33
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	35
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	36

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa		
Country (ies):	Burundi		
Project Title:	Natural landscapes rehabilitation and Climate Change Adaptation in the provinces of Bujumbura and Bujumbura Mayor through a Farmer Field School approach		
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/BDI/037/LDF		
GEF ID:	8010		
GEF Focal Area(s):	Natural Landscapes Rehabilitation and Climate Change Adaptation		
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (DGA, DGE, DGMAVAE, BPEAE Bujumbura, CMSMF, IGEBU, OBPE & ISABU)		
Project Duration (years):	Four years		
Project coordinates	N°	Commune	Coordinates
			Latitude
			Longitude
	1	Kabezi	3°31'46.0"S
	2	Kanyosha	3°27'21.5"S
	3	Mutambu	3°31'45.3"S
	4	Nyabiraba	3°27'20.1"S
	5	Muha	3°25'53"S
6	Mukaza	3°24'00"S	
7	Ntakangwa	3°21'10"S	
			29°22'21.8"E
			29°21'05.6"E
			29°25'40.6"E
			29°28'28.3"E
			29°21'24"E
			29°22'59"E
			29°23'52"E

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	March 01, 2019
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01-Jan-2019
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31-Dec-2022
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 5,877,397
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	USD 17,500,000

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

³ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	USD 1,617,653
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	USD 3,000,000

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	The last Steering Committee meeting was held on September 21, 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	Underway
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	July-September 2022
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	N/A
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Under review as MTR is being finalized

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	<i>MS</i>
Overall implementation progress rating:	<i>MS</i>
Overall risk rating:	<i>M</i>

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	<i>Moderate</i>
---	-----------------

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	3 rd PIR
--	---------------------

⁴ For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

⁵ Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Désiré Nibasumba, National Project Coordinator	Desire.Nibasumba@fao.org
Budget Holder	David Phiri, FAO Representative a.i Burundi	David.Phiri@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Stefano Mondovi	Stefano.Mondovi@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Paola Palestini, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, OCB	Paola.Palestini@fao.org

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)

<i>Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.</i>							
Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating¹¹
To address the root causes of landscape degradation due to climate change and unsustainable land uses by rehabilitating degraded land and adapting integrated farming and natural resources systems to climate change	Outcome 1: Strengthened capacity to implement climate change adaptation priorities of the PNCC and the SNPACC at communal, provincial and national level	Note: all LDCF Core Indicators are under revision. AMAT Indicator 9: Number of people trained to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures (disaggregated by gender)	None trained	50 staff members at regional and national levels and 2 per commune	At least 150 staff members in Regional and national governments and 20 communal staff have received training	The Project has recruited an International consultant to carry out the training of staff members. The training of 75 first staff members is planned for October 2022	MU

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.



¹⁰ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**, **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.


in the provinces of Bujumbura and Bujumbura Mayor		AMAT Indicator 6: Risk and vulnerability assessments and other relevant technical assessments carried out and updated	0 at commune level in project area	5 vulnerability and restoration opportunity assessments (mapping of natural resources, description of agrarian systems and their vulnerability, 15 national best practices, 10 local CCA best practices, and agrobiodiversity assessments)	5 assessments	2 assessments were carried out by two National Consultants, natural resources were mapped, agrarian systems and their vulnerability were described, 16 national best practices were recommended based on CCA best practices; A 15 days' workshop was carried out by a team of six (06) Experts to map land uses by using the Collect Earth tool and a 5 days' workshop was organized from June 21 to June 25, 2021 to present the results of the 2 studies to different stakeholders at communal level	HS
		Level of institutionalization of the FFS approach	Strategy only implemented in 2 communes	Operational guidelines prepared	Level of institutionalization of the FFS approach	An international FFS Expert was recruited to support the institutionalisation of the FFS approach; the recruitment of the international FFS Expert was delayed by the restriction of travelling in the COVID-19 pandemic context. The Mid Term Review (MTR) will need to reassess this indicator, and most likely propose a change in alignment to the Government's new	MS



						<p>approach “Centres de rayonnement” which are model farming systems on bigger plots of more than one hectare.</p> <p>Meanwhile, there is already an operational FFS Coordination Unit within the MINEAGRIE.</p>	
		<p>Institutional arrangements to lead, coordinate and support the integration of climate change adaptation (CCA) into relevant policies, plans and associated processes</p>	<p>No coordination mechanism for ecosystem-based development or for FFS harmonization</p>	<p>2 mechanisms partly operational (for FFS harmonization and CCA coordination)</p>	<p>2 mechanisms fully operational</p>	<p>An International Consultant and a National Consultant specialists in CCA were recruited to train decentralized services of the MINEAGRIE including the meteorological services in order to integrate CCA and meteorology information into FFS</p>	<p>MU</p>
		<p>Number of Communal development plans integrating CCA practices</p>	<p>No communal development plans integrate CCA practices</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Climate Change focused land use, vulnerability, agrarian systems and agro-biodiversity assessments were carried out; based on findings, 4 communal development plans in Bujumbura Province were prepared and 15 watershed action plans were developed for the 15 hills of the Project intervention area.</p> <p>Moreover, the Project has planned in the Annual Work Plan (AWP) to recruit a National Consultant to support in</p>	<p>S</p>

						the updating of communal development plans integrating CCA practices	
	Outcome 2: Improved resilience of agro-ecosystems and populations through enhanced capacity to implement CCA/CSA	Note: all LDCF Core Indicators are under revision AMAT Indicator 4: Extent of adoption of climate-resilient technologies/practices: Number of people, % female	3% of households adapt their behaviour or practices to climate change	40% of target households (30% women) adopt adaptation practices.	80 % of target groups adopting adaptation technologies by technology type (disaggregated by gender)	The adoption of climate-resilient technologies / practices is currently implemented by 300 FFS group members. The FFS are implemented by 150 Facilitators trained by Master Trainers from the MINEAGRIE; 300 FFS target groups are currently operational on the 15 hills of the Project area in the Bujumbura Province including 6,126 women (70%) and 2,627 men (30%); In the meantime, 30 FFS were implemented in the Bujumbura Mayor since the 2022 B agricultural season to support 3,102 beneficiaries among them 1,284 women (41%), 1,000 men (32%) and 818 youth (27%); the support consists of providing the Producers' Organizations (POs) with various inputs including maize, bean and vegetable seeds; forest and agroforestry seeds for nurseries and agricultural implements	S

		Number of FFS, number of program managers, master trainers, and facilitators trained in project site. Number of farmers trained,	None	300 FFS 20 master trainers 75 facilitators (30% women) 0 existing master trainers refreshed 75 existing facilitators refreshed 3000 farmers trained (30% women)	300 FFS 20 master trainers 75 facilitators (30% women) 40 master trainers refreshed (20 existing and 20 new) 150 facilitators refreshed (75 existing and 75 new) 10.000 farmers trained (30% women) TBD FFS Outputs	An international FFS Consultant was recruited to train 20 master trainers; the recruitment of the international FFS Consultant was initially hampered by the restriction of travelling in the COVID-19 pandemic context. The Project has trained 150 Facilitators who are implementing 300 FFS out of which 40% are women. As the duration of training sessions for facilitators was too short, the project will organize a refresh training for facilitators.	S
Outcome 3: Climate risks are mitigated through decision support tools and sustainable landscape management	Note: all LDCF Core Indicators are under revision AMAT Indicator 2: Type and extent of assets strengthened and/or better managed to withstand the effects of climate change	0	2.000 ha of degraded woodlands and 100 km of river banks	At least 5.000 ha of degraded woodlands and 300 km of river banks	2.389 ha of degraded woodlands and 101 km of river banks were rehabilitated (check files attached)  Analyse technique du rapport final ERB 12 n  Analyse technique du rapport final RBU 200	HS	
	AMAT Indicator 7: Number of people/	62%	75%	90%	A Letter of Agreement was signed with the Burundi	MU	

		geographical area with access to improved climate information services	People are regularly getting updated climate information from the Burundi Geographical Institute (IGEBU) through televisions and radios. Also, there is a meteorological station in the Nyabiraba commune and another at the Bujumbura Airport			Geographical Institute (IGEBU); IGEBU will support in installing rain gauges and limnimetric scales and collect climate information on a regular basis as from September 2021	
		Existence of a forest co-management regulations application text	None exists	1 application text	1 application text	The project has planned to recruit a national consultant to carry out a review of existing regulatory frameworks for the subsequent development of the application text. National Legislation documents available include the Environment Code and the Forest Code. These two documents provide regulations regarding forest co-management	U

		Level of implementation of agrobiodiversity strategy	None	Agrobiodiversity strategy created and partially implemented	Agrobiodiversity strategy fully implemented	A LoA was signed with ISABU so as to develop the agrobiodiversity strategy.	MS
	Outcome 4: Communities deploy a diversified set of resilient livelihood strategies in the project areas	Note: all LDCF Core Indicators are under revision AMAT Indicator 3: Population benefiting from the adoption of diversified, climate-resilient livelihood options	Resilience score related to agricultural practices: 9.61/20 (women-led households: 10.62) Overall resilience score: 8.43/20 (women-led households: 8.43)	Medium resilience level (12/20) (for both indicators)	High resilience level (14/20) (for both indicators)	The mid-term SHARP report has not yet been produced	-
		Number of new value chains developed and number of existing value chains strengthened	None	2 existing value chains strengthened	1 new value chain and 3 existing value chains strengthened	The value chain Expert of the Project, was recruited and started his duties on October 15, 2020. During his field visits in the Project intervention area in the Bujumbura Province, he organized consultation meetings with beneficiaries' representatives who identified and categorized priority value chains  Stratégie développement des C	S

						 Cartographie des chaînes de valeur 037  Priorisation des chaînes de valeur 037	
		Number of cooperatives or pre-cooperatives with strengthened capacities to access markets	None	5 cooperatives or pre-cooperatives	10 cooperatives or pre-cooperatives	According to the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock, there is one cooperative per hill of the Project area. This means that the Project has 15 cooperatives to be strengthened; the Bujumbura Provincial Directorate for Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (BPEAE Bujumbura) has already identified 51 Producer’s Organizations / Cooperatives which are supported by the Project in various inputs including seeds and materials; The Project has planned to provide Producers’ Organizations / Cooperatives with 4 storage sheds in the 4 communes of the Bujumbura Province, equipment for mushroom production and beekeeping	S

						Meanwhile, the Project is supporting 32 Producers' Organizations in the 3 communes of Bujumbura Mayor with maize, bean and vegetable seeds	
	Outcome 5: Project implementation based on results-based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated	Number and types of documents and tools developed to monitor and evaluate the project and share knowledge	None	<p>M&E framework developed</p> <p>Mid-term evaluation conducted</p> <p>Project newsletter published annually</p> <p>SHARP assessment conducted at mid and end term</p> <p>Collect-Earth assessment conducted</p>	<p>M&E framework developed</p> <p>Mid-term evaluation conducted</p> <p>Project newsletter published</p> <p>Final evaluation conducted</p> <p>SHARP assessment conducted</p> <p>Collect-Earth assessment conducted</p> <p>Document on project best practices and lessons learned developed</p>	<p>Three PPR (Project Progress Reports) from July 1, 2019 to December 2019, from July 1, 2020 to December 31, 2020 and from July 1, to December 2021 and two PIR (Project Implementation Reports) from July 1 2019 to June 2020, from July 1 2020, to June 2021 and from July 1, 2021 to June 2022 were prepared;</p> <p>The FAO Communication Expert prepares newsletters and tweets on lessons learned;</p> <p>A 15 days' workshop was carried out by a team of six (06) Experts to map land uses by using the Collect Earth tool;</p> <p>The Mid-term evaluation is underway as from May to August 2022</p>	S

Action Plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: Strengthened capacity to implement climate change adaptation priorities of the National Climate Change Policy (PNCC) and the National Strategy and Action Plan on Climate Change Adaptation (SNPACC) at communal, provincial and national levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training of 75 staff members from decentralized services from the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock including the meteorological centers and services in order to integrate the climate change adaptation and meteorology information into FFS; - Reassess the level of the institutionalization of the FFS approach and formulate recommendations in line with the Government's new approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International and national Consultants specialists in climate change adaptation (CCA) - MINEAGRIE & FAO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 15/10/2022 - During the No Cost Extension (NCE) period as from January to June 2023
Outcome 3: Climate risks are mitigated through decision support tools and sustainable landscape management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To purchase and install rain gauges and limnometric scales - Collect climate information on a regular basis by FFS group members in collaboration with IGEBU - To recruit a national consultant to carry out a review of existing regulatory frameworks for the subsequent development of the application text - Develop the agrobiodiversity strategy and action plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAO & IGEBU - FFS group members - FAO - ISABU 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 15/10/2022 - 01/11/2022 - 15/11/2022 - 15/12/2022

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1: Strengthened capacity to implement climate change adaptation priorities of the National Climate Change Policy (PNCC) and the Climate Change National Strategy and Action Plan (SNPACC) at communal, provincial and national levels				
Output 1.1.1: Natural resources and ecosystem services, climate change vulnerability of agrarian systems and land uses are fully mapped and assessed in the province of Bujumbura using an integrated landscape approach	5 vulnerability and restoration opportunity assessments (mapping of natural resources, description of agrarian systems and their vulnerability, 15 national best practices, 10 local CCA best practices, and agrobiodiversity assessments)	Agrobiodiversity assessments carried out by Bioversity International	Mapping of natural resources, description of agrarian systems and their vulnerability, 15 national best practices, 10 local CCA best practices	Agrobiodiversity assessments were not carried out by Bioversity International as planned; an LoA was prepared with ISABU to conduct the agrobiodiversity assessments replacing Bioversity International.
Output 1.1.2: An action plan for agrobiodiversity enhancement and restoration is prepared	An action plan is prepared	An action plan is prepared for agrobiodiversity enhancement and restoration	Plan not prepared	The action plan was to be prepared by Bioversity International as planned; the action plan will be prepared by ISABU instead, in October 2022
Output 1.1.3: Awareness raising activities and trainings on CCA and IRNM	At least 150 staff members in regional and national governments and 20	75 staff members are trained	Recruitment of international and national	The training has not taken place yet

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹³ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

are carried out with MINEAGRIE staff from the national, provincial and communal levels	communal staff have received training		Consultants to carry out the training –	
Output 1.1.4: The FFS harmonization strategy is implemented at the national level and operationalized by a coordination unit within the MINEAGRIE	The FFS harmonized strategy is operational	A FFS coordination unit within the MINEAGRIE is operational	The FFS coordination unit is in place within the MINEAGRIE	The FFS coordination unit needs to be strengthened The LTO organized a mission in June 2022 for backstopping
Output 1.1.5: A cross-sectoral coordination mechanism for CCA action is supporting coordinated CCA at the national and communal levels	The agriculture and rural development inter-sectoral group (GSADR) is operational at provincial level	2 meetings are supported by the Project at provincial level	The meetings were not organized	The Bujumbura provincial GSADR which actually is not operational needs to be strengthened; the Project has planned to organize GSADR meetings as from October 2022
Outcome 2.1: Improved resilience of agro-ecosystems and populations through enhanced capacity to implement CCA/CSA				
Output 2.1.1: Gender-responsive training materials integrating CCA and INRM practices are specifically developed to accommodate FFS needs	14 training modules	Training modules are developed	Training modules are available	
Output 2.1.2: A core group of program managers, master trainers, extension officers and facilitators trained in locally adapted CCA and NRM practices as well as in methods to resolve CCA related conflicts	40 Master Trainers and 150 FFS Facilitators are trained and/or refreshed	20 Master Trainers and 75 FFS Facilitators trained	75 FFS Facilitators trained	The refreshing of 20 Master Trainers has not taken place yet
Output 2.1.3: A total of 300 FFS are established covering 15 hills in 4 communes	300 FFS	180 FFS	180 FFS groups established (150 FFS in the Bujumbura Province and 30 FFS groups in Bujumbura Mayor)	330 FFS groups were established (300 FFS in the Bujumbura Province and 30 FFS in the Bujumbura Mayor)

Outcome 2.2: Climate risks are mitigated through decision support tools and sustainable landscape management				
Output 2.2.1: Participatory decision support tools for climate change analysis developed to reduce risks	Rainfall data are collected and rain calendars are developed	A LoA is signed with the Burundi Geographical Institute (IGEUB)	The LoA with IGEUB was signed	The procurement procedures are still ongoing to purchase 5 rainfall gauges and 21 limnimetric scales in accordance with the recommendations from IGEUB Experts
Output 2.2.2: 5000 ha of degraded woodland and 300 km of river banks are identified and rehabilitated	5,000 ha of degraded land and 300 km of riverbanks	2,000 ha of degraded land and 100 km	2,389 ha of degraded land and 101 km of riverbanks were rehabilitated with 704,788 forest trees, 2,235,235 agro-forest trees and 112,926 bamboo cuttings	The remaining 2,611 ha of degraded land and 199 km of riverbanks will be rehabilitated during the current 2022 forestry campaign
Output 2.2.3: Appropriate legislation and procedures are in place for community forest co-management	The Forest Code is enforced	A LoA is signed with the Provincial Directorate for Environment, Agriculture and Livestock of Bujumbura (BPEAE Bujumbura) to supervise all activities related to landscapes rehabilitation	The LoA was signed by the Minister of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE)	The BPEAE Bujumbura started its activities as from January 2022
Output 2.2.4: Community management groups and incentive mechanisms are established for forest co-management and stabilization and management of river banks	Community sub-catchment management groups are established	15 sub-catchment management groups are established on the 15 hills in the Bujumbura Province	15 sub-management committees are in place and are involved in forest co-management and riverbanks stabilization	The BPEAE Bujumbura carried out training sessions to 60 committee members in forest co-management and riverbanks management
Output 2.2.5: Agrobiodiversity action plan prepared in 1.2 implemented and monitored	Agrobiodiversity action plan	A LoA is signed with the Burundi Institute for Agricultural Sciences (ISABU) to develop the agrobiodiversity action plan	The LoA is awaiting signature by the Minister of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock.	The agrobiodiversity action plan was to be prepared by Bioversity International, however a new implementing partner was identified (ISABU). The contract is being finalized and ISABU is to deliver the action plan by

				November 2022 according to the LoA work plan
Outcome 3.1: Communities deploy a diversified set of resilient livelihood strategies in the project areas				
Output 3.1.1: Value chain diversification and strengthening strategies are developed	A strategy is developed	A value chain strategy is developed	The strategy was developed by the Project Value Chain Expert	The strategy is being operationalized
Output 3.1.2: Twenty-four interventions in four communes implemented to support value chain diversification and strengthening	24 interventions are identified	24 interventions (6 per commune) were identified: 4 storage sheds, mushroom production, beekeeping, livestock rearing (pigs), improved wood saving cooking stoves and small processing facilities (grinding mills)	Procedures are underway for the acquisition of 600 pigs, 4 storage sheds and mushroom production	The remaining interventions should be implemented during the No Cost Extension (NCE) phase as from January 2023 to June 2024.
Output 3.1.3: New and existing value chains structured and organized around FFS groups	10 Pre-cooperatives are structured and organized around FFS groups	15 pre-cooperatives (1 cooperative per hill) are structured and organized in the Bujumbura Province	The coaching of 15 pre-cooperatives members is carried out by the Project value chain Expert	The training of pre-cooperatives is planned from September 2022
Outcome 4.1: Project implementation based on results-based management and application of project lessons learned in future operations facilitated				
Output 4.1.1: Operational system for collection of field-based data to monitor project outcome indicators	The Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Plan is prepared	Progress reports are produced including Project Progress Reports (PPR) and Project Implementation Reports (PIR)	The Project reports are produced on a regular basis	Currently the Project does not have an M&E Expert The process of his recruitment is going on.
Output 4.1.2: Midterm and final evaluation conducted	The MTR is conducted	The MTR is conducted	The MTR is being carried out by an International Consultant and a National Consultant and the initial report was submitted	The MTR final report is set to be submitted in August 2022
Output 4.1.3: Project-related “best-practices” and “lessons-learned” disseminated via	Publication of monthly newsletters	Newsletters and tweets are published	Newsletters and tweets were published specifically during the training of FFS Facilitators, the Steering Committee meetings and	Provided that a communication Expert is aligned to the Project, newsletters will be published on a monthly basis

publications and other means			other fieldworks; best-practices and lessons-learned were documented	
------------------------------	--	--	--	--

4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

- The Project has successfully put in place 300 FFS implemented by 150 FFS Facilitators;
- 11,855 FFS group members are involved in various activities including crop production, natural landscape rehabilitation (forest, agroforest and fruit tree nurseries, tree planting and riverbanks protection); 2,389 ha of degraded land and 91 km of riverbanks were rehabilitated with 704,788 forest trees, 2,235,235 agro-forest trees and 112,926 bamboo cuttings;
- FFS group members manifest a high engagement in implementing the Project activities and in finding appropriate solutions to deal with various challenges such as crop disease outbreaks, lack of materials and inputs for tree nurseries, etc.;
- NGO “Empowering Response Burundi” and “Réseau Burundi 2000 Plus” are doing their best in supporting FFS group members in implementing various Project activities respectively in the Provinces of Bujumbura and Bujumbura Mayor;
- Letters of Agreements (LoA) were signed with various institutions relevant to the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock including the Vegetable and Fruit Multiplication Center (CMSMF), the Burundi Geographical Institute (IGEBU) and the Provincial Directorate for Environment, Agriculture and Livestock in the Bujumbura Province (BPEAE Bujumbura), whilst LoA with the Burundi Office for the Protection of the Environment (OBPE) and the Burundi Agricultural Sciences Institute (ISABU) are still to be signed by the Minister of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock;
- The Project implementation encounters many challenges including the Project start delayed for more than 15 months, the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) is lacking full time M&E and FFS Experts, the recruitment of International Consultants to carry out various trainings;
- The procurement of various goods and services take too long and most of the time many suppliers withdraw their Purchasing Orders;
- In order to speed up the implementation of the Project activities, a catch-plan was prepared and highlighting the activities which need a No Cost Extension.



29 06 2022 Plan de
rattrapage 037 LDF nc

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	MS	Provided that the Project start-up was delayed for more than 15 months, a low delivery of 30% is recorded on June 30, 2022, whilst the Project NTE is initially scheduled for December 31, 2022. A catch-up plan was prepared accordingly and the delivery expected by December 31, 2022 is estimated at 60%. In order to fully achieve the Project objectives and expected results, there is a need of a No Cost Extension phase.
Budget Holder	MS	MS	The project under report has just completed more than 2 years of implementation. The impact that COVID-19 has had on the project and the delay in putting in place the human resources for the proper implementation of the project has not allowed the project to achieve the results initially planned. In fact, while the delivery rate was 13.33% in June 2021, it is 27.5% at the end of June 2022. The deployment of activities on the ground is not yet effective. Indeed, a number of activities are still in the process of starting up. The level of implementation of the co-financing counterpart is still low and that which is implemented is limited to the in-kind contribution of the sectoral Ministry. An acceleration or recovery plan has been developed and is being implemented and the coordination team will be reinforced by the recruitment of a Technical Assistant to support the team. It is important to foresee an extension at no additional cost of at least 18 months to compensate for the time observed during the active period of the COVID-19

¹⁵ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.

For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

			pandemic and quite to the other imponderables observed during the 2 years of implementation of the project.
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸			<i>Ratings/comments</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	MS	MU	<p>Although the Covid-19 context did not facilitate the start of the project, the project activities are not carried out in a rational way nor are alternative strategies identified to overcome the difficulties. The project has a very weak delivery, the overall action lacks a strategy that links the activities together and creates the necessary complementarity and synergies between the components of the project.</p> <p>About 6 months ago, a catch-up plan was proposed to reorient the planning of activities and the execution of the project, but it was not interpreted correctly due to weak technical and managerial capacities.</p> <p>As LTO, I am very concerned about the coordination of the project, which does not guarantee the quantity and quality of the activities carried out. A substantial change in the PCU is strongly suggested.</p>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	The project is experiencing major delays. These have accumulated throughout implementation. Action is being take to address delays – including a catch-up plan however, the targets proposed in such plan remain unrealistic given the project duration. The MTR will support with identifying what should be prioritized for the remaining period and reassess indicators and targets accordingly. A Chief Technical Advisor is being recruited to support the PMU with improving monitoring and planning tools.

¹⁸ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

¹⁹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
The project will probably establish planted forests within local communities under the FFS activities.	Obtain clearance from LTO or HQ Technical Officer for technical specifications regarding the trees to be used for reforestation	Technical specifications form cleared by LTO or HQ unit	None	LTO/PCU
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
The will probably provide seeds to local communities under the FFS activities. Seeds will be local and not imported.	Obtain clearance from LTO or HQ Technical Officer for technical specifications of seed to be purchased	Technical specifications form cleared by LTO or HQ unit	None	LTO/PCU
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
Only under specific condition where no alternatives are available, the project will supply low-risk pesticides to local communities under the FFS activities.	Use low risk pesticide and obtain clearance from LTO or HQ Technical Officer for technical specifications	FFS member groups are using biopesticides Technical specifications form cleared by LTO or HQ unit	None	LTO/PCU

	regarding the pesticide procurement			
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
A small number of Batwa ethnic group people is living in the intervention zone	Carry out FPIC throughout the implementation of the project, i.e. reach consent (step 1-4) prior to start of activities and ensure monitoring/ document lessons learned (step 5-6) during implementation	FPIC has not been carried out yet	The FPIC report will be carried out by the end 2022	LTO/PCU
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social (ESS) Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
M	Yes, the Environmental and Social Risk classification still valid.

Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.

²⁰ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
	Section A: Risks to the project					
1	Political instability and civil disturbances (force majeure)	Low	Y	Monitoring of political situation and planning ahead for contingency	The political situation is well monitored	No political instability was reported so far
2	Weakening of political support for the project at any level (from colline to national)	Low	Y	Proactive and continuous efforts must be made to maintain this support or strengthen it if it begins to weaken	There is no weakening of political support	The administration is supporting the Project interventions through the mobilization of communities
3	Lack of receptiveness and interest from communities to the project	Low	Y	This should also be addressed proactively, as communities should be engaged in a way that builds their interest for the project	There is no lack of receptiveness and interest from communities	The communities are very involved the implementation of Project's activities

²¹ Risk ratings means a rating of accesses 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: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Destruction of roads by extreme weather events limits accessibility to project sites	Moderate	Y	Plan for alternate communication means to avoid having to use damaged roads. Value chain development efforts is taking into account risks related to road accessibility	In its co-financing letter, the National Program for Food Security and Sustainable Development of Imbo and Moso (PNSADR-IM) intends to develop rural infrastructures through road rehabilitation for USD 2,288,558; but due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the rehabilitation work has not yet started	PNSADR-IM has not yet started the road infrastructure rehabilitation
Section B: Environmental and Social risks from the project						
1	Provision of seeds for cultivation only	Moderate	Y	Obtain clearance from LTO or HQ Technical Officer for technical specifications of seed to be purchased	Clearance on technical specifications is always granted	Clearance obtained with some delays sometimes
2	The project could establish planted forests	Moderate	Y	Obtain clearance from LTO or HQ Technical Officer for technical specifications regarding the trees to be used for reforestation	Technical specifications are cleared by LTO or HQ unit	Tree seeds are provided by OBPE (Burundi Office for the Protection of the Environment)
3	The project may need to procure, supply and/or result in the use of pesticides on crops, livestock, aquaculture or forestry	Moderate	Y	Use low risk pesticide and obtain clearance from LTO or HQ Technical Officer for technical specifications regarding the pesticide procurement	No pesticides have been used yet	Communities are using biological methods for pest control

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	There are indigenous peoples living in the project area	Moderate	Y	Carry out FPIC throughout the implementation of the project, i.e. reach consent (step 1-4) prior to start of activities and ensure monitoring/ document lessons learned (step 5-6) during implementation	The FPIC report is not yet produced	The FPIC report will be produced in October 2022

Project overall risk rating (Low, Moderate, Substantial or High):

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Moderate	No changes recorded since the previous reporting period


7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

If the project had an MTR or a supervision mission, please report on how the recommendations were implemented during this fiscal year as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	The MTR is currently underway till September 2022 and recommendations will be formulated in the final report
Recommendation 2:	Idem
Recommendation 3:	Idem
Recommendation 4:	Idem
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	No

8. Minor project amendments

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% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management	<p>A budget revision was carried out in order to create a budget line "Cash transfer" to enable the rehabilitation work and the organization of seed fairs. Also It was suggested to purchase an off-road vehicle to facilitate the Project Management Unit during field trips</p>  <p>Révision_Budgétaire_GCP_BDI_037_18_mai_2021</p>	The budget revision was submitted and approved in May 2021	FAO GEF
Implementation schedule			
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other			

²² Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
The Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE)	The MINEAGRIE is the main implementing partner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The MINEAGRIE has signed a co-financing engagement amounting to USD 7,265,141 to support the implementation of the Project activities; - The MINEAGRIE provided the Project Management Team with Offices based in Rohero, INSS Suburb, 13, Makamba Avenue; - The MINEAGRIE provided the Project Coordination Unit with counterpart staff including a Secretary and a Caretaker; - The MINEAGRIE has put in place a Project Steering Committee to monitor the implementation of the Project activities; - The MINEAGRIE signed Letters of Agreements with FAO and implemented by the Provincial Directorate for Environment, Agriculture and Livestock in the Bujumbura Province, the Fruit and Vegetable Seed Multiplication Center and the Burundi Geographical Institute; - The MINEAGRIE is in the process of signing two Letters of Agreement with the Burundian Office for the Protection of the Environment (OBPE) and the Burundi Agricultural Sciences Institute (ISABU) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Project Steering Committee was put in place in August 2020 whilst the Project start was planned for January 1, 2019; - Sometimes, the MINEAGRIE takes too much time to sign Letters of Agreements
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			



Empowering Response Burundi	To support the implementation of FFS groups in the Bujumbura Province	300 FFS groups and 51 Producers' Organizations / Cooperatives identified	Delay in the recruitment of the NGO (April 2021)
Réseau Burundi 2000 Plus	To support the implementation of FFS groups the Bujumbura Mayor	30 FFS groups and 32 Producers' Organizations supported	Delay in the recruitment of the NGO (April 2021)
Private sector entities			
Potential suppliers of goods and services	Provide the Project with high quality certified seeds and various materials	Supply of maize, bio fortified beans, vegetables, forest and agro-forest seeds and materials for landscape management	Long procurement procedures
Banking sector	To assist in the payment of the manpower involved in high labor intensity work during the landscapes rehabilitation work	Production of trees in nurseries, tree planting and riverbanks' protection	Late payments due to substituting the BCB partnership with ECOBANK
Others[1]			
Communities-based groups (CBOs)	CBOs have greatly contributed in the identification and categorization of priority value chains during awareness meetings	15 pre-cooperatives (1 cooperative per hill) were identified in the Bujumbura Province	The pre-cooperatives need to be strengthened
New stakeholders identified/engaged			
N/A			

[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.


10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	Gender analysis was conducted during the baseline stage
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	The women represent more than 60% in FFS member groups and Producers' Organizations / Cooperatives
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	Yes	The women represent more than 60% in FFS member groups and Producers' Organizations / Cooperatives
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	Women are fully participating in decision-making
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	Women, youth and indigenous people are generating socio-economic benefits through the Village Savings and Lending Associations particularly in the Bujumbura Province
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	The M&E system was put in place in FAO Burundi and has gender-disaggregated data; the Project is tracking gender results and impacts by using gender sensitive tracking tools; indicators of products, results and impacts of the Project are disaggregated taking into account gender sensitive tracking tools such as attendance lists in FFS activities, agroecosystem analysis sessions and data collecting forms
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	The Project staff doesn't have gender expertise however, the FAO Representation in Burundi has a gender Focal Point supporting the project
Any other good practices on gender		The Project is contributing to gender equality taking into account sex, age, and indigenous people without taking into account ethnic, religious and political considerations

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
<p>Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a knowledge management approach within the Project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Assessments were carried out by two Consultants to map natural resources and their vulnerability; the action plans developed accordingly at communal level were shared to the public during five workshops organized in the provinces of Bujumbura (4 workshops) and Bujumbura Mayor (1 workshop); o A 15-day workshop was organized to map natural resources in both provinces by using the Collect Earth Tool and the results were shared to the public during the workshops stated above. - Relevant good practices than can be learned and shared from the Project are the followings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Utilization of highly productive certified maize, bean and vegetable seeds; o Climate change adaptation and resilience through crop diversification and rotation; o Improving soil fertility by planting leguminous crops such as beans that increase nitrogen in the soil; o Water and soil conservation practices through tree and bamboo planting for degraded landscapes rehabilitation and riverbanks protection.
<p>Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAO Burundi has elaborated a communication strategy applicable to all FAO implemented projects. The communication strategy is operationalized by an Expert who produces newsletters and tweets on best practices for every project.
<p>Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people’s livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Through Village Savings and Lending Associations (VSLA), FFS group members managed to raise 549.102.000 BIF in the Bujumbura Province from rehabilitation activities. <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;">   </div>

2022 Project Implementation Report

<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<p>The Project does not have his own website</p>
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<p>- This is one example of the newsletters produced by the communication officer with some success stories during the training session of 75 FFS Facilitators:</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>NEWSLETTRE DE LA FAO PUBLISHER FINAL</p> </div>
<p>Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details</p>	<p>The new current FAO Burundi communication and knowledge management Focal Point is called Joseph NSABIYABANDI, Mobile: +257 79 983 657; email: Joseph.Nsabiyabandi@fao.org.</p>

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, please briefly explain.

The FAO Management Team in Burundi has recommended the Project to capitalize the findings from a similar study carried out by another GEF funded Project GCP/BDI/040/GFF (see report attached).



Indigenous peoples and other local communities are fully involved in the implementation of project activities. They are very few Batwa in the Nyabiraba Commune of the Bujumbura Province who are associated in all FFS activities including value chains development, landscapes rehabilitation and riverbanks protection. The Project activities are not likely to affect the livelihoods of the Batwa people.

Meanwhile, the FPIC report is planned to be carried out from August to September 2022.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
GEF Agency	IFAD/PNSADR-IM	In Kind	6,166,859	0	0	6,166,859
GEF Agency	WB/PRDAIGL	In Kind	4,068,000	0	0	4,068,000
Government	MINEAGRIE	In Kind	7,265,141	USD 3,000,000 offices + Secretary + Caretaker from MINEAGRIE as from April 2020)	3,000,000	7,265,141
TOTAL			17,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	17,500,000

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

N/A

²³ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
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 yield 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 modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve 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 environment 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 environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
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 resented as “good practice
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a 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 is 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 rating. It should assess 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.