



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

**2019 – Revised Template**

Period covered : 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Sub-Saharan Africa
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Burkina Faso
<b>Project Title:</b>	Integrating Climate Resilience Into Agricultural and Pastoral Production for Food Security in Vulnerable Rural Areas Through the Farmers Field School Approach
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	<b>GCP/BKF/054/LDF</b>
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5014
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Climate change (adaptation)
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Hydro-Agricultural Development (Ministère de l'agriculture et des aménagements hydro-agricoles), Ministry of Environment (Ministère de l'environnement), Ministry of Animal and Aquatic Resources (Ministère des Ressources animales et halieutiques), Ministry of Research (Ministère de la recherche) and operational partners (AMUS, ARFA)
<b>Project Duration:</b>	4 years (+ 8 months with no cost extension)

### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	7/31/2014
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	5/1/2015
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	4/30/2020
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	04/30/2020
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 3 810 000
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 19 435 000

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

<sup>3</sup> Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

<sup>4</sup> This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	USD 3,117,131
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 61 900 453

### Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	12/28/2018
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	September 2017
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	September 2017
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	November 2019
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>Yes</b>

### Ratings

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	<b>S</b>	
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	<b>S</b>	
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	<b>Low</b>	

<sup>5</sup> Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

<sup>6</sup> Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

## Status

<b>Implementation Status</b> <i>(1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	
--	---------------------	--

## Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Marie Bernadette Kiebre-Toe (FAOBF)	<a href="mailto:Marie.Kiebretoe@fao.org">Marie.Kiebretoe@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Onyango, Vivian (AGPM)	<a href="mailto:Vivian.Onyango@fao.org">Vivian.Onyango@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Sau, Dauda (FAOBF)	<a href="mailto:Dauda.Sau@fao.org">Dauda.Sau@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division</b>	Maude Veyret-Picot (CBC) Dirkmaat Chris (CBC)	<a href="mailto:Maude.Veyretpicot@fao.org">Maude.Veyretpicot@fao.org</a> <a href="mailto:Chris.Dirkmaat@fao.org">Chris.Dirkmaat@fao.org</a>

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s):</b> Enhance the capacity of Burkina Faso's agricultural and pastoral sectors to cope with climate change, by mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) practices and strategies into ongoing agricultural development initiatives, and agricultural policies and programming and upscaling of farmers' adoption of CCA technologies and practices through a network of already established farmer field schools (FFS).						
<b>Specific objective 1:</b>	The number of hectares benefitting from improved sustainable land management and therefore improved resilience and adaptation to climate change	0		15 000 ha distributed as follows : - 5 000 hectares of managed extensively grazed rangelands (including 800 hectares of naturally assisted regeneration); - 5 000 hectares of managed semi-intensively grazed rangelands - 5 000 hectares of agricultural land (dryland cereals and fodder crops)	20 432,75 ha of land sustainably managed, including 15 632,75 ha cropland and 4 800 ha of pasture land (including co-financing)	HS

<sup>7</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Specific objective 2:</b>	Farmers / breeders supported (sensitized)	0	N/A	26,000 farmers / breeders supported (sensitized)	29,201 trained including 10528 from GEF and 18673 from co-financing	HS
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Commitment of partners to contribute to the implementation of CEP and CEAP	<b>Indicator 1.1</b> No. of partners committed to contributing to implementation of FFS/APFS Strategy.	The Ministries for Agriculture, Animal Resources and Environment, through 14 projects operating in the project areas have been targeted for contributing to implement the FFS/APFS strategy. These 14 projects are: PNVACA, PSAN-BF, PNSA, PAPSA, NEER-TAMBA, PRDI, PNB2 Programme, Ouagadougou Peri-Urban Dairy Sector Development Project, Improving Zebu Azawak Raising and Sustainable Pasture Land Management Project, ZEPESA, PASF, COGEL, PAFASP, and Helping Households Vulnerable to	FFS/DFF strategy prepared and under implementation by Project and co-financers	50% of the partner programmes (i.e. 7 partners) have entered into a written commitment to supporting implementation of FFS/DFF strategy	To date, 8 partner projects are collaborating with the project as co-financing partners. However, only the PNVACA (12.5%) signed a memorandum of understanding with the project. In 2019, 14 memoranda of understanding will be signed with regional and NGO directorates (Agriculture, Livestock, environment, AMUS & ARFA ) for the establishment and animation of the APFS and Local Investment Fund for Adaptation (FILA) microprojects.	S

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>																													
		Malnutrition and Climate Change through NTFP Value Chain Development in Burkina Faso. In the baseline, they have no commitment to FFS or diversity field fora (DFF) approach.																																	
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Transfer and adoption of technologies	<b>Indicator 2.1</b> Percentage of targeted groups adopting adaption technologies by technology type	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2">Percentage of adoption</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Man</th> <th>Woman</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Technologies types</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Manure pits</td> <td>9,25</td> <td>6,5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zai</td> <td>37</td> <td>26,5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Stony cords</td> <td>47,75</td> <td>34,5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fattening</td> <td>41</td> <td>35,75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Forage crops</td> <td>8,5</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RNA</td> <td>14,25</td> <td>15,5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Agroforestry park</td> <td>8,75</td> <td>3,5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Percentage of adoption		Man	Woman	Technologies types			Manure pits	9,25	6,5	Zai	37	26,5	Stony cords	47,75	34,5	Fattening	41	35,75	Forage crops	8,5	7	RNA	14,25	15,5	Agroforestry park	8,75	3,5	20% increase	100% increase	Awareness-raising and training of targeted communities in adaptation technologies continues through the APFS. The project's close supervision by the facilitators is believed to improve the percentage of adoption of innovations <sup>10</sup> that	
	Percentage of adoption																																		
	Man	Woman																																	
Technologies types																																			
Manure pits	9,25	6,5																																	
Zai	37	26,5																																	
Stony cords	47,75	34,5																																	
Fattening	41	35,75																																	
Forage crops	8,5	7																																	
RNA	14,25	15,5																																	
Agroforestry park	8,75	3,5																																	

<sup>10</sup> Innovation is considered here as any idea, a practice that allows people to better adapt to climate change. It concerns plant, animal and forest production and even organizational aspects. For example, the SHARP tool used at the start of the project helped to identify a number of constraints related to climate resilience. Two of these constraints related to sustainable land management and livestock productivity. The "improved zai" and the "livestock technical package" (house + food + health) are two innovations introduced to APFS to solve these constraints. These are innovations because they are new for beneficiaries who did not use them before.

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					will be evaluated at the end of the project	
	<p><b>Indicator 2.2</b> Types of adaptation technologies transferred to targeted groups</p>	<p>16 types of climate-resilient agricultural technologies are widely adopted Negligible adoption of climate-resilient technologies in livestock sector.</p>	<p>1 new technology being utilized.</p>	<p>At least 5 types of new livestock technologies (or management practices) are being utilized.</p>	<p>Six new livestock technologies have been introduced: forage crops, crop residue storage, industrial agro product (IAP/SPAI), poultry feed manufacturing, lick stone blocks for ruminants, animal care practices, 100% achievement for this indicator. In addition 2 environmental management technologies have been promoted: assisted natural regeneration (ANR/RNA)), improved stoves and five agricultural technologies: improved seeds,</p>	<p>S</p>

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					production and use of manure, zaï, stone bunds, halfpipe, were introduced to beneficiaries in the FFS/APFS Their adoption will be evaluated at the end of the project.	
<b>Outcome 3: Adaptation to climate change</b>	<b>Indicator 3.1 :</b> Adaptation actions implemented in national/sub-regional development frameworks (number and type).	No actions are implemented with regard to livestock. Commune development plants (PCD) have no budget for livestock-related climate change adaptation actions.	0	Two national livestock-related policy initiatives (SNVACA and one other) are currently implementing adaptation actions.	The national livestock extension and advisory services (SNVACE / TCP / BKF / 3605) currently being implemented by the MRAH take adopt the APFS approach and integrate natural resource management and climate change adaptation. This project is a co-financing from FAO to the GEF project. It complements the actions undertaken for the institutionalization of the APFS and CCA approach through the decree on the creation, the	S



## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>attributions and the functioning of an inter-ministerial committee (MAAH, MRAH, MEEVCC, MESRI) in charge of promoting the APFS approach in Agricultural Extension and Agricultural Advisory Strategies in Burkina Faso.</p> <p>In addition, a consultant carried out a study for climate change adaptation mainstreaming, looking into climate adaptation actions in 50 communal development plans (CDPs/PCDs)</p>	
	<p><b>Indicator 3.2</b> Development frameworks that include specific budgets for adaption actions (list type of development framework and briefly describe the level of action)</p>	<p>PCD have no budget for livestock-related climate change adaptation actions.</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>50 PCD have a budget for climate adaptation.</p>	<p>12 PCDs have been reviewed by the COGEL partner project, ie 24% of achievement of this indicator.</p> <p>The diagnostic study conducted provided potentials on how to fully embed climate</p>	<p>MS</p>

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					change adaptation into updated PCDs. Thus, a methodological guide will be developed with the support of the PCD consultant and the gender expert to facilitate climate change and gender mainstreaming in PCD planning.	
	<p><b>Indicateur 3.3</b> Number and type of targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability (describe number and type).</p>	<p>Technical departments in regional governments, provincial governments and communal governments have basic understanding of climate change and are not able to apply it to their work.</p>	<p>FFS have developed community action plans (Outcome 2) and are engaging with regional, provincial and commune technical agencies</p>	<p>In at least 2 regions, 2 provinces and 10 communes, technical departments are applying climate change knowledge in their work related to livestock raising.</p>	<p>Several modules on the APFS approach, climate information and adaptation to climate change have been developed. These modules were taught to 17 farmer field school master trainers, 20 APFS master trainers from 12 regional directorates, 257 facilitators from 16 provincial directorates, 40 communes (10 CO, 11 East, 10 CN and 09 Sahel). 65 supervisors from 16 provincial</p>	<p>S</p>

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>											
					<p>directorates, three central directorates and partner projects and programs. That is more than 100% achievement for this indicator.</p> <p>According to Specific Objective 1 and 2, this translates into 29,201 farmers trained including 10,528 from GEF (and 18673 from co-financing)</p> <p>This also translates into 20 432.75 ha of managed land through co-financing including 500 ha on GEF financing (cf. Specific Objective 1 and 2)</p>												
	<p><b>Indicateur 3.4</b> Number of staff trained on technical themes (per theme) - (disaggregated by gender) The adaptation themes to be</p>	<p>Technical staff in concerned regional governments, provincial governments and communal governments have had no formal</p>	<p>Staff identified and awareness raised.</p>	<p>At least one staff member in 4 regional governments, 4 provincial governments and 20 communal governments have received training related to climate change and</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2"></th> <th colspan="2">Number of trained staff</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Man</th> <th>Woman</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>03 Centrales administrations (DGPV, DGPA, et DGESS/Master trainer</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>12 régionales administr</td> <td>17</td> <td>03</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Number of trained staff		Man	Woman	03 Centrales administrations (DGPV, DGPA, et DGESS/Master trainer	2	1	12 régionales administr	17	03	S
	Number of trained staff																
	Man	Woman															
03 Centrales administrations (DGPV, DGPA, et DGESS/Master trainer	2	1															
12 régionales administr	17	03															

## 1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019			Progress rating <sup>9</sup>								
	covered are/including (and disaggregated by gender). Improved resilience of agricultural systems; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improving land fertility and productivity;</li> <li>Erosion control/soil water conservation</li> </ul>	training on climate change.		integrated crop/animal/tree management systems.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>ations (Master trainers)</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>16 provincial Administrations (supervisors)</td> <td>60</td> <td>05</td> </tr> <tr> <td>40 communes Administrations (facilitators)</td> <td>206</td> <td>51</td> </tr> </table>	ations (Master trainers)			16 provincial Administrations (supervisors)	60	05	40 communes Administrations (facilitators)	206	51		
ations (Master trainers)																
16 provincial Administrations (supervisors)	60	05														
40 communes Administrations (facilitators)	206	51														
<b>Outcome 4: Monitoring and evaluation</b>	<b>Indicateur 4.1</b> Progress in achieving project outputs and outcomes.	No outputs achieved	20% of outputs and outcomes achieved	All outputs and outcomes achieved	Monitoring tools have been designed and proposed to partners for the regular collection of data on school fields. These tools are informed by the technical support unit that is present at the field school level, including facilitators, master trainers, advisors for local activities and the expert in monitoring and evaluation.  The data collected through these tools	S										

**1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)**

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>are analyzed and serve as a basis for discussion with project beneficiaries and partners. These data also make it possible to monitor the progress of activities and facilitate reporting.</p> <p>The half-yearly reports have been delivered timely.</p>	

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>11</sup>

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
	Indicator 3.2 is MS, so please elaborate here.		

---

<sup>11</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>13</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>14</sup>					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>15</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
<b>Output 1.1.</b> 60 senior managers trained in climate-resilient agro-pastoral practices	Q2 Y4	30 managers trained	35 managers trained	N/A	N/A		108%	<p>A total of 65 managers (national and regional), including 5 women, received training in climate-resilient agro-pastoral practices through the APFS approach.</p> <p>This training concerned the provincial directors of the ministries in charge of rural development and the staff of the partner projects and programs. Women are very poorly represented at this level of responsibility, hence their limited number.</p> <p>The total of 65 is higher than the initial target of 60</p>

<sup>12</sup> Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

<sup>13</sup> As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

<sup>14</sup> Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

<sup>15</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

								managers and indicates the interest of technical and implementing partners in the project.
a) Map of best practices, of climate resilient cultivars/varieties, and of institutional support mechanisms collected from across the sub-Region. b) An agreed series of best practices and of appropriate varieties/cultivars to be used in BKF	Q2 Y3	<i>MoU with the National Institute for Environment and Agricultural research (INERA)</i>	<i>Catalogs Electronic physical are published</i>	<i>A map/catalogue of best practices</i>	<i>A map/catalogue of best practices published</i>		100%	An inventory of 42 good agro-silvo-pastoral practices has been developed. From this inventory, 7 climate-resilient best practices have been extracted to make 1 catalog with the support of INERA experts.  To date, 1000 copies of the catalog have been distributed with all stakeholders.  To improve the access of this catalog to the greatest number of technicians, it is planned to share it via the website being created.  Mapping of institutions and institutional arrangements that can facilitate the dissemination of good practices have been highlighted. This also facilitated elaboration of the distribution list of the catalog.
<b>Output 1.3.</b> A strategy for the adaptation of	Q4 Y2	<i>Awareness of actors on the gaps, weaknesses</i>	<i>Strategy formulated and approved</i>	<i>Done</i>	<i>Done</i>	<i>Done</i>	100%	The APFS strategy was developed and discussed in the regions at monthly meetings with. It was then validated by



the FFS approach and the introduction of DFF		<i>and the situation of equality for men and women</i>	<i>by the concerned actors</i>					all the partners and beneficiaries' representatives (95 participants) at the national validation workshop held in January 2017.
<b>Output 2.1.</b> Implementation areas and 500 partners and partnering communities identified	Q1Y1	<i>In the 4 regions, 236 FFS communities identified</i>	<i>In the 4 regions, 168 APFS communities identified</i>	Training of agro-pastoralists under way	Training of agro-pastoralists under way	Done	80,8%	As a reminder, the budget revision approved in 2016, resulted into a downward revision of output targets. The reduction in the number of facilitators was translated into a reduced number of targeted partnering communities.
<b>Output 2.2</b> 20 Maîtres Formateurs (dont au moins 30% de femmes) de CEAP et CEP sont sélectionnés et formés	Q4Y2	Training modules finalized and master trainers selected	17 FFS master trainers (including 1 woman - 5,88%) and 20 APFS master trainers (including 3 women - 15%) trained	20 APFS master trainers (including 3 women - 15%) recycled	Done	Done	170 % for FFS MTs and 200% for APFS MTs	A total of 40 master trainers, including five women, underwent the 45-day training course in the APFS tool and also received 5 days of training in the SHARP tool. This exceeds the initial target of 20 master trainers. As the engineering level is one of the criteria for the selection of master trainers, women are less represented because they are poorly present in agricultural training courses and rarely reach this level of training. Also, the location of the project in well-defined areas did not favor the representation of female engineers in these areas

<b>Output 2.3</b> CCA and other best practices integrated into APFS and FFS curricula/training	Q4Y2	<i>FFS and APFS training modules finalized (with at least 30% focused on women's activities)</i>	<i>FFS and APFS training modules finalized (with at least 30% focused on women's activities)</i>	<i>FFS and APFS training modules finalized (with at least 30% focused on women's activities)</i>	Done	Done	100%	During the recycling session of May 2018, about ten modules (including new themes such as armyworm, ethno-veterinary medicine, development of business plans, gender, etc.) were animated by the experts. These modules complement the ones already provided on climate change adaptation best practices.
<b>Output 2.4</b> 500 APFS and FFS facilitators trained in integrated crop/livestock/tree systems	Q4Y3	<i>Training modules finalized and facilitators selected</i>	118 FFS facilitators, including 21 women (17,79%) and 139 APFS facilitators, including 30 women (21,58%) trained	139 APFS facilitators including 30 women (21,58%) recycled	168 endogenous APFS facilitators trained		85%	The APFS facilitators already trained in the context of the co-financing project BKF/605/BEL have been benefited from. The extension of the duration of the project also enabled the training of 168 second-generation facilitators. These endogenous facilitators are consisting of deserving beneficiaries who have successfully completed the 18-month APFS training cycle. They are trained to be facilitators in their core community.
<b>Output 2.5</b> 26,000 Pastoralist/farmers trained and implementing new practices	Q4Y4	23 042 beneficiaries trained through FFS (including co-financing)	6 159 beneficiaries trained through APFS (including co-financing)	Continuation of the training cycle of 6 159 APFS beneficiaries (including co-financing)	Continuation of the training cycle of 6 159 APFS beneficiaries (including co-financing)		112,31%	The target was not altered as a result of the budget revision, despite the reduction in facilitators. The target was indeed achieved thanks to the mobilisation of co-financing.

<b>Output 2.6</b> Dissemination of climate-resilient APFS and FFS approaches.	Q4Y4	Sensitisation and awareness raising of partner projects and programmes	1 memorandum of understanding signed	1 memorandum of understanding signed			12,5%	This output is very low due to the fact that many of the projects and partner programs mentioned in the prodoc were closed at mid level implementation of the project. So, the coordination unit favored the technical and operational partners for the dissemination of the approach. The project's technical team has prioritized collaboration with technical and operational partners. Thus 18 Partnership agreements were signed with them from June 2017 to February 2019. These partnerships favored the establishment and the animation of the CEAPs in the 4 regions. In addition, some FAO projects (SNVACE and 605 / BEL) have adopted the approach in their intervention strategy.
<b>Output 2.7.</b> Improved availability of information on weather for 100 local agro-pastoral communities	Q3Y4	n/a	n/a	Recruitment of the agro-meteorological expert and agro-meteorological information validated and service provider	124 APFS in 3 regions (Central West, North Center and Sahel) benefited from agro-weather information through local		124%	The rainfall information's (water levels recorded during the past week, the forecasts for the coming week and the agricultural advice to producers) were disseminated in French and local languages. The broadcasting has been done through six local radio and the short messagers to master trainers and facilitators of stations present in the project

				recruited for its dissemination	radios and SMS alerts			area (from June to October 2018). This action will be continued by the National Meteorological Agency as part of its sovereign activities. This campaign has made it possible to cultivate among agro-pastoralists the reflex to seek climatic information before any agricultural decision. Interactive programs organized on the local radios concerned showed that the producers find this information beneficial. They facilitate the planning of agricultural activities in that we know when and where to carry out agricultural activities (sowing, application of fertilizers, etc.)
<b>Output 2.8.</b> Secured land assets (50 land delineation packages approved)	Q4Y4	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	Recruitment of expert. Sensitization of beneficiaries. 30 delineation measures developed in the context of the co-financing projects Neer-Tamba (18)	119 delineation measures developed, including 71 for co-financing projects were approved		238%	Access to land is a sine-qua-non and fundamental condition for stimulating a dynamic of sustained and sustainable economic growth, especially in a country with an agricultural vocation. To promote the transfer and adoption of adaptation technologies, land must be secured with legal documents. So, 18 sensitization sessions on land security were organized for the benefit of about 360 members, including 100 women from 18 CEAPs in 53 communes and 89 villages. Better organization of actors

				and ACD (12).				around secure sites can facilitate access to funding, technology and technical support. Several sites have been secured by the project "Action against Desertification (25)" and Project 1 of the Resilience Program to Food and Nutrition Insecurity in the Sahel (10) and Neer Tamba (36) and GEF projet 054/LDF (48), These contributions are part of co-financing and contribute to the sustainable management of livelihoods. 119 delineation measures have been capitalized with a total area of 934.27 ha.
<b>Output 2.9</b> Local Adaption Investment Fund (FILA) for at least 50 FFS/APFS	Q4Y4	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	Establishment of AVEC Training of AVEC (Associations villageoises d'épargne et de crédit – village associations) Expert recruited for the formalization of community action plans to receive	- Master trainers, facilitators and FFS/APFS members trained on the AVEC and Financial Education modules ; - 50 microprojects selected ; - development of community action plans for APFS		50%	50 microprojects were selected by regional committees chaired by the governors of the regions. Equipments, inputs and animals to be used for the implementation of these microprojects have been synthesized and are being acquired by the purchasing unit. Beneficiaries will receive training in project management to ensure project success and sustainability

				FILA funding	members done ; Procurement requests for microprojects submitted			
<b>Output 3.1</b> A coordination mechanism on CCA across 5 ministries involved in livestock and crop production extension	Q4Y3	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	An interdepartmental working group set up; A decree for the creation of an inter-ministerial committee prepared for signature	- An inter-ministerial decree on the creation, allocation and operation of a coordinating committee to promote the APFS approach has been signed - An exploratory study of policies related to climate change was conducted by the international expert adviser on politics		100%	At the end of the advocacy and sensitization, an agreement signed between the Ministries in charge of rural development (agriculture, livestock, environment and research) setting up an inter-ministerial committee for the promotion of the CEAP and adaptation practices to climate change was signed. This committee, chaired by the Secretariat for the Coordination of Agricultural Sector Policies, has already held a session with the financial support of the project. Its sustainability will have to be ensured by the budget of the ministries concerned. It will have to facilitate the institution of the approach through consultation.
<b>Output 3.2</b> Strengthened National Extension System	Q4Y4	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	Workshop organised at the SNVACA	PNVACA replay agenda pending		75%	Institutionalisation of the APFS approach ongoing thanks to the above mentioned decree. Each ministry has its sectoral extension policy. Ministries in

(SNVACA) – incorporating APFS approach and strengthening approach to climate change								charge of agriculture and livestock have already integrated the CEAP approach into their extension document
<b>Output 3.3</b> 50 Commune development plans (PCD) updated to account for climate resilience across agro-pastoral activities	Q4Y4	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	An analysis of the 50 PCD carried out; 12 PCD modified/updated with support of the co-financing COGEL project	A guide for taking climate change into account		50%	The process of updating PCD is relatively long and resource-intensive. The resources planned by the project do not allow to sufficiently cover the entire process. However, a guide for taking climate change into PCDs has been finalized with the support of PCD expert.
<b>Output 4.1</b> System for systematic collection of field-based data to monitor project outcome indicators operational	Q4Y4	<i>Two six-monthly progress reports prepared (one PPR and one PIR)</i>	<i>Two six-monthly progress reports prepared (two PPR and one PIR)</i>	<i>Two six-monthly progress reports prepared (two PPR and one PIR)</i>	<i>One six-monthly progress reports prepared (one PPR and one PIR)</i>		87,5%	Monitoring and data collection continue to facilitate reporting.
<b>Output 4.2</b> Midterm and final evaluation conducted	Q4Y4	<i>Baseline study</i>		<i>Mid-term review conducted</i>			50%	With project extension, final evaluation is postdated.

<b>Output 4.3</b> Project-related “best-practices” and “lessons-learned” for enhanced adaptation to climate risk of the agricultural sector are disseminated via publications, project website and others	Q4Y4	n/a	n/a	APFS approach and SHARP experience disseminated during workshops and seminars; -Press Releases ; - Waiting for the creation of the FAOBF website to publish the results of the project.	- A sub regional workshop for training and sharing experiences on CEAP organized in December 2018 - Sharing the results of internship on Agricultural Innovations at the Origin, Diversities and Territories forum from 19 to 21 September 2018 in Turin, Italy.		75%	Project results dissemination ongoing during 2019.



## Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

### **Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):**

Max 200 words:

The APFS are a good complement to the FFS, which is the agricultural extension approach adopted by the Government of Burkina Faso. Advocacy process at the start of the project allowed the adoption of the intervention strategy by all stakeholders (government, NGOs, agro-pastoralists). The cascading trainings made it possible to reach all the categories of actors and favor the adoption of the approach at scale. The pooling of skills through co-financing has made it possible to exceed the targets set in terms of the number of beneficiaries trained in climate resilience and areas exploited in a sustainable manner.

Training of local facilitator is an initiative introduced by the project team to strengthen the sustainability of climate resilience. The local facilitators are selected from the beneficiaries who have followed the 18 months of training diligently and then applied the good practices in their family farm.

### **What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?**

Max 200 words:

The major challenge was to institutionalize in a short time the APFS approach by involving the three ministries in charge of rural development (agriculture, livestock, and environment).

The second challenge is to take into account the APFS approach in the new SNVACA, knowing that at present, each of the 3 ministries is developing its own strategy. This situation explains the low hit rate of the target.

The third challenge relates to the local adaptation fund (FILA), the nature of which as described in the project document (revolving fund) did not fit with FAO's procedures. The search for a strategy for its implementation has been a source of delay. Still, a solution has been found and micro-projects will soon be financed and become operational. Results and their contribution to resilient livelihoods will be assessed at project closure.

The fourth challenge is the lack of control over the PCD revision schedule and the limited budget to reach the target set. Finally, the budget revision started in October 2018 was a long and time-intensive exercise for the project team.

**Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment**

	<b>FY2019 Development Objective rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>FY2019 Implementation Progress rating<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	With the project's initial closing period scheduled for April 2019, the project team has invested to reach the maximum number of targets. During the reporting period, almost all of the indicators of success delivered fully (100%) and some of them even exceed expected results. The project has reached a satisfactory level of implementation and has kept the target of the beneficiaries to be reached. Nevertheless, three indicators show relatively low rates. These are the operationalization of local adaptation found (FILA), the revision of the PCD, the integration of the APFS into the new SNVACA. FILA has experienced implementation delays related to its nature (revolving fund) and FAO procedures. PCD and SNVACA have structural limitations that will be reviewed with the extension of the project duration.
<b>Budget Holder</b>			The project team has doubled its efforts in mobilizing partners and raising awareness among stakeholders. These sensitization activities and the agreements with the national partners enabled the mobilization of co-financing and the national financial contribution. Budget execution has slowed down due to the budget review with activity freeze from October 2018 to April 2019. However, the project's achievements must be consolidated and valued by mobilizing additional funding with the GEF or other donors

<sup>16</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>17</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<p>The project team have endeavoured to realize most of the project outcomes with many over achieved. Positively noted is the continued emphasis on greater involvement of beneficiaries in the project to enable sustainability. At government level, an inter-ministerial coordination team on CCA can also be a means to ensure activities are better integrated. However technical aspects aimed at improving governance such as mainstreaming CCA in to development plans as expected need considerable time beyond a typical project time-frame. That said, the beginning of the process and discussions through this project is itself good progress.</p>
--	----------	----------	--

---

<sup>18</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

<p><b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b></p>	<p><b>S</b></p>	<p><b>S</b></p>	<p>The project team has been implementing the project intervention logic and innovative, participatory and integrated approaches diligently. This has resulted in the achievement of largest part of the expected results and adaptation benefits. In these final stages of the project implementation phase, one is looking into the sustainability of results, the socio-economic and resiliency impact and potential exit strategies. A strong argument in favour of sustainability of achieved results (in addition to the project’s change theory that foresaw CCA mainstreaming into key policy documents of priority sectors, a well-established grassroots network of APFS master trainers and facilitators and sensitised and informed agro-pastoral communities), is the blend of partnerships that was established, not only to deliver expected project results, but also to scale successes and secure continuity.</p> <p>A gender analysis had not been done during project design, but the project team secured a gender lens was added to the project intervention logic. Even though some sex-disaggregated indicators score poorly (e.g. portion of female master trainers trained), women have been given equal opportunities to benefit from the project intervention, to participate in its decision-making, and eventually, to have equal access to natural resources. These benefits result in a visible empowerment of women in the communities we visited during the reporting period. Investments are made agro-pastoral production and management practices that are traditionally led by women, women are involved in the prioritisation process of adaptation practices to be adopted, are trained and given the means to replicate and scale up. It would be great if the project team could document testimonies of project beneficiaries, and provide evidence as to how the project approach, contributes to resilient production systems, resilient livelihoods, and improved food security and nutritious diets.</p> <p>In the remaining and final months of project implementation, the team will need to focus on delivering the micro-projects, and assess their success, their potential to deliver sustainable and resilient livelihoods for both women and men in vulnerable rural communities. Time is limited, which is a pity. This is likely going to jeopardize the optimal execution of this output, which would have a negative impact on the sustainability of the LDCF investment.</p>
---	-----------------	-----------------	--

### 3. Risks

#### Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>19</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	No ESS was carried out, but the project classifies as low risk.

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

#### Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the <b>Project Document</b> and reflects also <b>any new risks</b> identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, <b>as relevant</b>.</i>

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>20</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>21</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Limited partnership development hinders project implementation.	L	There is a real partnership. The government has pledged to encourage co-financing and has disbursed a portion of the national counterpart contribution		

<sup>19</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

<sup>20</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

<sup>21</sup> If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period”.

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>20</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>21</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Seed deficiency caused by climate variability shock, prolonged droughts, and / or the announcement of pests and diseases with the risk of crop / pasture failure in the project.	H	The appearance of the fall armyworm in 2017 and 2018 in West Africa affected parts of Burkina Faso and, to a lesser extent, the Western Central region, one of the project areas. Ongoing response plan with support from FAO should lead to emergency solutions not to inhibit producers' efforts		The fall armyworm is a high risk not anticipated at project inception. This is a new risk.
3	The security crisis in northern Mali and Niger lead to insecurity in Burkina Faso and/or a large influx of displaced populations.	H	All agencies of the United Nations system operating in the project areas have grouped together in common premises to pool efforts and better coordinate their actions with displaced populations.		

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L	L	As stated in the previous paragraphs, the levels of risks that may impact the efficient implementation and results of the project have been mixed as the project progresses. The overall risk for the project is considered to remain low. The appearance of the fall armyworm in 2 of the 4 project intervention regions and the security crisis are likely to influence the impacts in terms of reducing food insecurity and the adoption of good practices. The project trained master trainers and facilitators on recognition and control of this pest.

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>22</sup>

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project Outcomes</b>	No	As per PIR 2018
<b>Project Outputs</b>	No	As per PIR 2018

### Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project extension</b>	<p>Original NTE: 30/04/2018                      Revised NTE: 30/04/2020</p> <p>Justification: The budget overrun on the Travel heading led to a budget revision started in October 2018. The exercise was very late and impacted the implementation of major activities such as the operationalization of FILA and the training of facilitators. The request for cost-free extension was made in the light of budget availability and the importance of the remaining activities in favor of sustainability.</p>

---

<sup>22</sup> Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

## 5. Gender Mainstreaming

**Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO**

**Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?**

Since the start of the project, gender equality has been taken into account with the support of the gender expert from the Extension Directorate of the Ministry of Agriculture and the National Coordinator of the project who also has demonstrated skills in the field of gender and development. These skills were strengthened with the recruitment of a gender expert in the project team in December 2017.

The M&E system has gender-disaggregated data, and project tracks gender impacts and results in the various project implementation phases (Master trainers, facilitators, technical partners and NGOs beneficiaries).

The approach developed has achieved a participation rate of more than 60% at this stage of implementation for both FFS and APFS beneficiaries.

Women and young people have been particularly interested in APFS, to initiate the implementation of through weekly meetings. This initiative is a success story and has been the basis for the introduction of the AVEC tool in the APFS, although it was not foreseen in the project document.

Also, based on gender involvement in the APFS and AVEC, FILA is anchored, for which 61% of the beneficiaries are women, with projects on small livestock (poultry, sheep fattening), cowpea production, processing of non-timber forest products.

Gender mainstreaming in the project include: gender disaggregated monitoring and evaluation indicators, gender expert analysis report, student master thesis framed by the project. The data by sex allow to conclude that the implementation of the project integrates the equality of chances and the equity in the offers to the men and women members of the APFS. They have had access to and control over the resources and the benefits that will flow from them.

However, female participation at the level of master trainers (typically engineers) and first generation facilitators (technicians) is more modest with rates of 15%. This is largely due to the fact that there are generally not many women in agricultural training programs. To counterbalance this trend, recommendations are made to the Government to attract girls to the agricultural sectors

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement



**Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.**

N/A

## 7. Stakeholders Engagement

**Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))**

Introduction and development of AVEC has resulted in greater ownership of APFS by beneficiaries. Some APFS have been set up as cooperatives, and many APFS plan and finance guided tours for non-CEAP members.

The commitment of APFS members resulted in their attendance during the 18 months of training cycle. This commitment has enabled the establishment and training of 168 endogenous facilitators. These second-generation facilitators represent local expertise to be valued by other projects and partners involved in their region.

No major changes for other stakeholder (ministries and NGOs) engagement as per PIR-2018.



AVEC members

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

**Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval**

Two activities implemented by the project contribute to generate and valorize endogenous knowledge: it is the veterinary ethno-medicine and the gene bank for local seeds.

These activities are conducted through the LoA signed with INERA. Data currently being processed will enhance knowledge of animal disease treatments and preserve resistant local seed varieties.

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits

The project will facilitate the learning of climate resilient practices through practice. Scaling up these projects has positive effects on sustainable land management and the environment.

-

- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.
- The publications are mainly press articles and are available at the project coordination unit. They will be posted on the website being created. A photo library is also available but a documentary film capitalization lessons learned in the CEAP is envisaged.

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>23</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Government's national counterpart	State budget	Co-financing in kind	USD 0	USD 245 455	USD 245 455	USD 245 455
FAO/Gouvernement	PSANBF Support to the Value Chain of PFNL, ACD, 605/Bel	Non-disbursing co-financing	USD 14 millions	Evaluation non finalisée		
Projects under the supervision of the Ministry of Agriculture	PNVACA	Non-disbursing co-financing	USD 4,075 millions	USD 58 851 858	USD 58 851 858	USD 67 863 283
	PAPSA					
	PAFASP					
	NEER-TAMBA					

<sup>23</sup> 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.

PRDI		TOTAL				
Projects under the supervision of the Ministry of Animal Resources	PNB 2	Non-disbursing co-financing	USD 1,3 millions	USD 1 626 439	USD 1 626 439	USD 1 626 439
	Ouagadougou Peri-Urban Dairy Sector Development Project					
	Livestock Improvement Project of Zebu Azawak and Sustainable Management of Pasture Areas					
ZEPESA						
Projects under the supervision of the Ministry of the Environment	PASF	Non-disbursing co-financing	Unspecified	USD 1 190 545	USD 1 190 545	USD 1 190 545
COGEL						
Projects under the supervision of the Ministry of Research	Projets Bioersity International	Non-disbursing co-financing	USD 60 000	Evaluation not finalized		
	TOTAL		USD 19 435 000	USD 61 914 297	USD 61 914 297	More than USD 70 925 722

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

No changes as per PIR-2018

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

**Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **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** – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **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.