



Project Implementation Report

(1 July 2022 – 30 June 2023)

Project Title:	SPWA-CC: Mini-Grid based on renewable energy (small-hydro and biomass) sources to augment rural electrification
GEF ID:	3943
UNIDO ID:	100260
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	GEF-4
Country(ies):	Nigeria
Region:	AFR - Africa
GEF Focal Area:	Climate Change Mitigation (CCM)
Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs¹:	N/A
Stand-alone / Child Project:	Stand-alone
Implementing Department/Division:	ENE / CTI
Co-Implementing Agency:	
Executing Agency(ies):	Federal Ministry of Energy, Energy Commission of Nigeria and Federal Ministry of Environment, Housing and Urban Development
Project Type:	Full-Sized Project (FSP)
Project Duration:	48
Extension(s):	5
GEF Project Financing:	2,621,797 USD
Agency Fee:	262,180 USD
Co-financing Amount:	14,556,900 USD
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	12/27/2011
UNIDO Approval Date:	3/7/2012
Actual Implementation Start:	3/7/2012
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2023:	USD 1,856,675.69
Mid-term Review (MTR) Date:	6/30/2015
Original Project Completion Date:	12/31/2015
Project Completion Date as reported in FY22:	12/31/2021

¹ Only for **GEF-6 projects**, if applicable

Current SAP Completion Date:	12/31/2021
Expected Project Completion Date:	12/31/2021
Expected Terminal Evaluation (TE) Date:	10/31/202
Expected Financial Closure Date:	12/31/2023
UNIDO Project Manager ² :	Josy THOMAS

I. Brief description of project and status overview

Project Objective		
<p><i>This project aims to promote private sector investments in renewable energy technologies in the form of small biomass based mini-grid as a viable option for augmenting the rural electrification programme in Nigeria. The overall objective of the project is to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through the creation of policy, regulatory and conducive market environment for promoting renewable energy based mini-grids to augment rural electrification and productive uses in the country.</i></p>		
Project Objective	Project Core indicators	Targets expected at approval stage
<p><i>To promote renewable energy (biomass) based mini-grid as an alternative to diesel based energy generation systems while reducing and avoiding GHG emission from the energy sector in Nigeria</i></p>	<p><i>1. Feasibility study, business plans and other power plant support/development activities and reports available for the potential replication sites.</i></p>	<p><i>Three Techno-economic feasibility studies, business plans and other essential reports for the three identified sites.</i></p>
	<p><i>2. Investors ready to invest and agreement signed for implementing the biomass based mini-grid project.</i></p>	<p><i>1. Investors are ready to invest in the biomass based mini-grid project identified for implementation.</i></p> <p><i>2. A biomass-based power plant including mini-grid is in operation.</i></p> <p><i>3. 25,000 t CO2 emission reduction annually from biomass electricity usage.</i></p> <p><i>4. Above 31,000 MWh of annual electricity supply to various users from biomass mini-grid.</i></p>
	<p><i>3. Favourable policy and investment conditions for biomass mini-grid projects.</i></p>	<p><i>1. Favourable policy and feed-in-tariff schemes are in place.</i></p> <p><i>2. More and more financing institutions and investors ready to finance/invest.</i></p> <p><i>3. Increased local capacity of institutions.</i></p>

Baseline

² Person responsible for report content

Only 40% of the total population has access to electricity. The majority of the people who have access to electricity live in urban areas. However, more than 50% of the Nigerian populations live in rural areas. Only less than 20% of the rural households have access to electricity. The electricity that is being supplied is also unreliable and of inferior quality for the end users with frequent shutdowns and grid failure. Most of the industries are not connected to national grid resulting in 100% dependency on diesel generators or diesel drives for their energy needs. The electricity generation cost becomes higher when diesel generators are used. The industries that are already connected to the Government electricity distribution lines receive electricity only for few hours a day. Hence, these industries also depend on their own backup diesel generators for their electricity needs. Due to diesel usage, the electricity cost for industries is very high resulting in an increase in production cost affecting their competitiveness. This limits the growth of the industries and hinders the overall development of the country. In addition, the usage of diesel also generates a considerable amount of GHG emissions.

Therefore, the project is expected to strengthen the policy, regulatory and institutional framework supporting the biomass and other renewable energy based mini-grid systems in Nigeria. Through detailed biomass resource assessments, potential sites will be identified for the replication of biomass-based mini-grids throughout the country.

Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and select corresponding ratings for the current reporting period, i.e. FY23. Please also provide a short justification for the selected ratings for FY23.

In view of the GEF Secretariat's intent to start following the ability of projects to adopt the concept of adaptive management³, Agencies are expected to closely monitor changes that occur from year to year and demonstrate that they are not simply implementing plans but modifying them in response to developments and circumstances or understanding. In order to facilitate with this assessment, please introduce the ratings as reported in the previous reporting cycle, i.e. FY22, in the last column.

Overall Ratings ⁴	FY23	FY22
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>	<i>Unknown</i>
<i>The project has been operationally closed since 2021 and no annual reports were submitted in the past two reporting period. However, the DO rating is Moderately Unsatisfactory since the 1.5 MW biomass gasification is yet to be operational.</i>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>	<i>Unknown</i>
<i>The project has been operationally closed since 2021 and no annual reports were submitted in the past two reporting period. However, the IP rating is Moderately Unsatisfactory since the 1.5 MW biomass gasification is yet to be operational.</i>		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Unknown</i>	<i>Unknown</i>

³ Adaptive management in the context of an intentional approach to decision-making and adjustments in response to new available information, evidence gathered from monitoring, evaluation or research, and experience acquired from implementation, to ensure that the goals of the activity are being reached efficiently

⁴ 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

Not Applicable. The project has been operationally closed since 2021.

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.

Please fill in the below table or make a reference to any supporting documents that may be submitted as annexes to this report.

Project Strategy	KPIs/Indicators	Baseline	Target level	Progress in FY23
Component 1 - Development of techno-economic feasibility studies and business plans for identified potential sites to facilitate replication.				
Outcome 1: Preparatory works completed for facilitating replication in the identified potential sites.				
Output 1.1: Techno-economic feasibility studies and business plans developed for the 3 identified potential sites to facilitate replication	1. Techno-economic feasibility studies and business plans for the identified sites	1. Techno-economic feasibility studies and business plans not available for the identified sites. 2. Very little information available on existing set-up and schemes	1. Three techno-economic feasibility studies and business plans developed for the identified sites. 2. Other compiled reports	Target was met before the project was operationally closed
Component 2 – Demonstration of techno-economic viability of biomass based mini-grid				
Outcome 2: Acceptance by stakeholders on the technical and financial viability of selected site for setting up the biomass based mini-grid for rural electrification.				
Output 2.1: A biomass based power plant of 5 MW installed capacity commissioned in the selected site along with mini-grid.	1. A biomass mini-grid of capacity 5 MW is established. 2. Electricity usage by the consumers. 3. CO2 emission reduction from biomass electricity usage.	1. Biomass based mini-grid not in place. 2. Diesel based power generation in the absence of biomass-based electricity. 3. No biomass electricity available	1. A biomass-based power plant including mini-grid is in operation. 2. 25,000 t CO ₂ emission reduction annually from biomass electricity usage. 3. Above 31,000 MWh of annual electricity supply to various users from biomass mini-grid.	A 1.5 MW biomass gasification power plant is under construction at Ikwo, Ebonyi State. The 1,000 kW and 500 kW gasification unit with gen sets for the rice clusters in Ikwo and Uhuru have been installed and awaiting commissioning.
Output 2.2 :Capacity for biomass power plant operation and maintenance and mini grid management developed	Trained personals in place for operation and maintenance of the biomass power plant including	No local capacity to operate, maintain power plant and mini-grid.	Number of operators identified and trained for the operation and maintenance of	The target was met before the project was operationally closed. Nothing was undertaken in the FY as it is operationally closed.

	management of mini-grid		power plant and mini-grid	
Component 3 – Strengthening of financial and policy environment to support RE based mini-grid systems				
Outcome 3: Conducive financing and policy environment for promoting investments in rural mini-grids in place				
Output 3.1 RPS, a strategic policy tool to promote RE systems, developed and put in place.	Renewable portfolio standard recommendation in place.	Existing policies do not promote biomass mini-grid projects and there are several barriers existing at present	Renewable portfolio standard recommendation for Nigeria in place	The target was met before the project was operationally closed. Nothing was undertaken in the FY as it is operationally closed.
Output 3.2: FiT for biomass power in place.	FiT for biomass power plant exporting electricity to national grid in place.	There is no FiT specific to the biomass projects in Nigeria.	FiT is in place for the biomass power projects.	The target was met before the project was operationally closed. Nothing was undertaken in the FY as it is operationally closed.
Output 3.3: Appropriate financing facility developed for RE related projects	More supportive financial environment are in place for biomass power projects.	Financial environment not in place to fund biomass mini grid projects	More financing options available to fund biomass projects	The target was partially met with the GEF grant
Output 3.4 Renewable energy related institutions strengthened	Number of renewable energy institutions that are strengthened in Nigeria.	Renewable energy institutions lack knowledge in biomass mini-grids.	At least 2 renewable energy institutions in Nigeria strengthened	The target was met before the project was operationally closed. Nothing was undertaken in the FY as it is operationally closed.

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.

Describe in tabular form the risks observed and priority mitigation activities undertaken during the reporting period in line with the project document. Note that risks, risk level and mitigations measures should be consistent with the ones identified in the CEO Endorsement/Approval document. Please also consider the project's ability to adopt the adaptive management approach in remediating any of the risks that had been sub-optimally rated (H, S) in the previous reporting cycle.

	(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	Inadequate policy, regulatory and institutional framework			The project is an independent mini-grid project that is not connected to the national grid. As such, it faces less regulatory issues and hurdles.	No risk experienced	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁵ New risk added in reporting period. Check only if applicable.

2	Power plant not in operation for its designed life time			Internationally accepted best practice project development steps will be carried out in the implementation of mini-grid project	The biomass gasification plant has been installed but yet to be test run and commissioned	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	No off-takers for the generated electricity			The electricity generated from the power plant is supplied to the rice mills and the other customers	No new progress, since the power plant is yet to be operational	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	No investors willing to invest in biomass mini-grid			In Project Component 2, UNIDO will mobilize investors to invest in the biomass mini-grids. During the last four years, UNIDO has conducted several activities related to the biomass power plant projects in Nigeria and already created awareness among the potential investors and lenders. Such activities already carried out by UNIDO in Nigeria is expected to help successful mobilization of financing both in the form of equity investment and loan for the mini-grid projects	A call for expression of interest was issued to identify private investors interested to develop the potential sites. Subsequently, shortlisted investors were invited to submit comprehensive proposal and four qualified. However, the qualified vendors couldn't reach financial closure stage and mobilize to site to start the construction.	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	Failure of Project implementation			UNIDO will mitigate this risk through detailed development of activities plans in close cooperation with in-country project partners, stakeholders and developers. Agreed and transparent modus operandi will be defined before the start of the project implementation	no new progress to date	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Flood			Power plant building, fuel storage area and site office will be located on an elevated area to prevent flooding. All	no new progress to date	

				buildings and structures will be designed and built appropriately to prevent flooding		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

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. Please also elaborate on reasons that may have impeded any of the sub-optimal risk ratings from improving in the current reporting cycle; please indicate actions planned for the next reporting cycle to remediate this.

NA

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

The travel ban and lock down policy due to the COVID-19 pandemic delayed the completion of the terminal evaluation. The terminal evaluation started just before the global lockdown was issued due to the rapid spread of the COVID-19 pandemic. The TE was suspended and postponed due to the difficulty of conducting a remote terminal evaluation. Following the delayed TE, the [project was operationally closed in December 2021](#).

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

NA

5. Please provide the **main findings and recommendations of completed MTR**, and elaborate on any actions taken towards the recommendations included in the report.

The key findings of the Mid Term Review (MTR) are summarized below as follows:

Relevance. The Project is very consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies of GEF and very relevant to the national development and environmental priorities and strategies of the Government and population of Nigeria, and regional and international agreements.

Design. The Project has a very good design which is in line with the national developmental needs of the country considering the power shortfall and adequate to address the problems at hand. It has been based on the outcome of various studies and verifications conducted by both external and internal consultants. The preparatory process has been based on wide consultations and participatory approach involving relevant national counterparts and beneficiaries participating in the identification of critical problem areas and the development of technical cooperation strategies.

Effectiveness. At the time of the MTR, the Project seems to be partly satisfactory in the light of successful project implementation. All the activities of the first period but the demo project were implemented in a very satisfactory way. However, due to the circumstances explained further in the Report, there is a significant delay on the commencement of the construction of the biomass power plant.

Efficiency. All component activities foreseen to be implemented in the first period have been implemented within the expected time frame including all preparatory activities for the demo project, except for the construction activity itself.

Sustainability. There are no issues that may pose significant possible risk affecting the sustainability of the Project. In financial terms, considering the commitments expressed so far and the resources invested in the Project, it is not much likely that the change of the Government would pose risk on the financial commitments to the Project. However, it is necessary UNIDO to follow up on this issue and to get a reaffirmation on the position from the owner's side.

M&E. The project has a plan for M&E which includes the Project Results Framework, the annual work plans as well as detailed progress and activity reports. The plan also includes and budgets for a mid-term evaluation and a final project evaluation.

Project management has been successfully carried out by the UNIDO Project Manager. On the side of the PMU, the absence on the position of national Project coordinator seems to affect on the coordination and information.

Key Conclusions

UNIDO's Mini grid based renewable energy sources to augment rural electrification Project is an excellent and very important concept with a numerous benefits on different levels. The Project is very in line with country's national strategic plans on energy, environment and socio-economic level. The Project for sure will bring great number of economic, institutional, social and environmental benefits on a local, regional and national level.

At this stage it is essential that all stakeholders give a good push within their roles and responsibilities. It is an opinion of the review team that there is no significant technical barrier that can stand on the way of the implementation once the first milestone payment is done by the owner of the Project.

However, there is room for improvement for each of the parties. UNIDO and the stakeholders need to make one good push on the implementation in order to overcome the most important obstacle – the first payment. Also, there is room for improvement in the management and coordination particularly having in mind that more important part of the project is yet to come in the second period.

Key Recommendations

The recommendations are separated according to the designees into: recommendations to UNIDO and recommendations to Stakeholders.

UNIDO:

- A delegation from UNIDO headquarters and Country Office to visit the new Governor on fund release as soon as possible.
- This is a crucial stage of the Project and all major parties need to have a meeting to reaffirm their roles and agree to make a strong decisive push on the implementation. Having heard that all administrative barriers on the fund release are now eliminated, it is necessary that all stakeholders get a reaffirmation on the commitment from the owner of the Project and a concrete date for the fund release.
- The Bank of Industry, as major stakeholder in APPL, on their interview meeting with the review team confirmed their commitment and expressed readiness to participate on such

meeting in order to consolidate the Project position on its implementation path. The meeting needs to be organized and to happen as soon as possible. Thereupon, the SC should be informed appropriately.

- UNIDO should make a serious case for the extension of the project life for 2 to 3 years.
- In order to capture the positive situation that has been created for a long time during the implementation of the project activities, and due to the delays that happen, it is necessary that the implementation is given more time. The extension time should mainly include the time for construction of the plant which according to the Contract should be 18 months, but also the time necessary for capacity building.
- A National Project Coordinator should be immediately designated and domicile at the Electricity Commission of Nigeria (ECN).
- The Project Coordinator should act as a connection between the SC and the PMU. This means intensive coordination activities, regular updating of SC with the latest developments on the project implementation. PMU may consider preparation of monthly communication letter to the SC as an effective information dissemination tool.
- Objectives and performance Indicators need to be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Trackable), and should, where possible indicate expected number of outputs. Where possible, the framework or the work plans should be revised as to give enough information about the outputs and targets, according to the findings.

Stakeholders:

- Ebonyi State Government should make an immediate payment of the first installment, as according to the agreements, showing a strong commitment and paving the road to the other APPL stakeholders.
- All stakeholders need to show a strong commitment in regards to the Project implementation and act to their roles and responsibilities at a highest possible level.
- Outstanding payments and contributions by all stakeholders should be made in order to speed up implementation.
- APPL may consider contacting the engineering, procurement and construction (EPC) contractor to make sure there is no issues related to the Contract conditions in regards to the delay and possible review.

The project has further conducted its terminal evaluation and is operationally closed. Excerpt from the recommendation of the TE is listed as follows:

- The recommendations drawn from this evaluation are that firstly, because the project objective of promoting biomass-based mini-grids as an alternative to diesel-based energy systems has only been partially met and the goal of reducing and avoiding GHG emissions has not yet been met, even after 10 years of implementation,
- The need to understand the causes for this, which is partly to do with the lack of continued good monitoring of progress and weak result-based management. Regular follow-ups and missions to support the construction of the biomass power plants should have been given priority by UNIDO when the project plan started to drift off course in 2016, in liaison with the key stakeholders and the Country Office.
- The Logical Framework should have been used as an interactive tool and adjusted as the project progressed to capture extra benefits that could arise to beneficiaries and stakeholders and to integrate benefits to gender mainstreaming that have been apparent in the project but not reported on.
- At the same time, the reporting needs to be tighter particularly in clearly accounting for financial flows through the project, including the counterpart funding (the amount of which is not clear to the evaluators), and to make sure that the principles of results-based management are followed.

IV. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

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 escalated to Category A or B).

Notes on new risks:

- *If new risks have been identified during implementation due to changes in, i.e. project design or context, these should also be listed in (ii) below.*
- *If these new/additional risks are related to Operational Safeguards # 2, 3, 5, 6, or 8, please consult with UNIDO GEF Coordination to discuss next steps.*
- *Please refer to the [UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures \(ESSPP\)](#) on how to report on E&S issues.*

Please expand the table as needed.

	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	NA	NA	NA
(ii) New risks identified during project implementation (if not applicable, please insert 'NA' in each box)	NA	NA	NA

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).

The project is operationally closed.

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.).

The project is operationally closed.

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

The project is operationally closed.

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 project is operationally closed.

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.

The project is operationally closed.

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

The project is operationally closed.

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.

According to the terminal evaluation report, the implementation of the project has been rated moderately satisfactory since most of the outcomes and outputs were achieved with moderate shortcomings except for the operationalization of the biomass gasification power plant

2. Please briefly elaborate on any **minor amendments**⁶ 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Results Framework	<i>N/A</i>
--------------------------	-------------------	------------

⁶ 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%.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Components and Cost	N./A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	N./A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Management	N./A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	Five extensions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity	N.A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity Category	N.A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor Project Objective Change	N.A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Safeguards	N.A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk Analysis	N.A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	N.A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-Financing	N.A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Location of Project Activities	N.A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others	

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

Please refer to the attached expense delivery report.

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.

The project is operationally closed.

X. Synergies

1. **Synergies** achieved:

Not Applicable.

3. **Stories to be shared** (Optional)

Not Applicable.

XI. GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate.

Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com>

Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location and Activity Description
<i>Ikwo, Ebonyi State, Nigeria</i>	<i>6.07451</i>	<i>8.1006</i>		<i>Ikwo, Ebonyi State, Nigeria. Installation of 1.5 MW biomass gasification power plant.</i>

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. **Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period, i.e. 1 July 2022 – 30 June 2023.
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 <u>all</u> 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 <u>achieve most</u> of its <u>major</u> global environmental objectives, and yields satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to <u>achieve most</u> of its major <u>relevant</u> 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 <u>some</u> of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to <u>achieve only some</u> of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected <u>not</u> to achieve <u>most</u> 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, <u>any</u> of its major global environmental objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Implementation Progress (IP)	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of <u>all</u> 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 <u>most</u> 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 <u>some</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of <u>most</u> components in <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of <u>none</u> of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk ratings	
Risk ratings will 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.