



Project Implementation Report

(1 July 2021 – 30 June 2022)

Project Title:	Promotion of small hydro power (SHP) for productive use and energy services in Burundi
GEF ID:	9056
UNIDO ID:	140332
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	GEF-6
Country(ies):	Burundi
Region:	East Africa
GEF Focal Area:	Climate change mitigation (CCM)
Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs¹:	N/A
Stand-alone / Child Project:	Stand-alone
Implementing Department/Division:	Department of Energy
Co-Implementing Agency:	N/A
Executing Agency(ies):	Ministry of Hydraulics, Energy and Mines
Project Type:	MSP
Project Duration:	48
Extension(s):	1
GEF Project Financing:	USD 1,575,155
Agency Fee:	USD 149,640
Co-financing Amount:	USD 6,530,000
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	06/05/2017
UNIDO Approval Date:	07/26/2017
Actual Implementation Start:	08/08/2019
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2022:	USD 341,593
Mid-term Review (MTR) Date:	04/20/2021
Original Project Completion Date:	07/25/2021
Project Completion Date as reported in FY21:	03/15/2022
Current SAP Completion Date:	12/31/2022
Expected Project Completion Date:	12/31/2022

¹ Only for GEF-6 projects, if applicable

Expected Terminal Evaluation (TE) Date:	12/31/2024
Expected Financial Closure Date:	06/30/2025
UNIDO Project Manager²:	Liu Heng

I. Brief description of project and status overview

Project Objective

The project focuses on creating a favourable environment for scaling up small hydropower (SHP) technology by private sector investment. The project will contribute to the twin goal of ending extreme poverty and boosting shared prosperity. The project intends to promote SHP plants to increase energy supply, as well as productive use of energy. Also, the project will focus on decentralized electricity generation and distribution by promoting micro-mini grids whereby providing energy access to small and medium-sized industries and benefiting rural communities.

More specifically, the main outcomes and deliverables expected under the project are as follows: (i) improving human and institutional capacity for continuous development of SHP projects; (ii) establishing the technical and economic viability of SHP technology; (iii) demonstrating SHP projects on a private-public partnership (PPP) basis for a cumulative 1 MW installed capacity leading to an overall direct emission reduction of around 63,072 tCO₂e; and (iv) facilitating a conducive investment environment leading to replication of at least 4 MW and overall indirect savings of 126,144 tCO₂e.

Baseline

Burundi is endowed with vast river resources as Malagarazi and Rusizi that stretch over a distance of 475 km and 117 km, respectively. The economically feasibility hydroelectric potential is about 300 MW and so far only 34 MW (about 11%) from it has been harvested. Small hydropower (up to 10 MW) installed capacity is 15.84 MW.

Civil conflicts in the 1990s had prevented the development of the country's electricity generation infrastructure. It was planned that investments will be made in new hydropower plants every years, but no such investment was made over the last decades. The on-going conflict has affected the development of private sector and foreign investment, and the country depends on foreign aid to fund about 50% of its national budget. Since there is no private sector participation in development projects, there is no technical capacity or skilled resources available for the energy sector in the country. All of the power generation for public utilisation is from available governmental power plants only. Thus, there is a lack of contribution from the private sector towards the development of energy sector in the country.

Apart from technical management, the complex nature of the energy sector further hinders the growth of electrification and in turn the SHP development. Overlapping responsibilities between the ministries such as the ministry of Energy and Minerals, the Ministry of Communal Development, and the Ministry of Finance (which is responsible for investment planning and coordination with foreign donors), slows down the growth process of SHP." Law of 27 April 2015, recognizing the electricity sector in Burundi" proposed that regulations would be devised in the future to promote Public-Private Partnership (PPP) in the energy sector. Accordingly, regulatory agency has been set up through law of 06 January 2016 for support of PPP in the country.

An on-going World Bank project includes pre-feasibility and feasibility studies of potential hydropower sites with capacities ranging between 1MW and 7.5 MW. It assumed that these potential sites could be realized in approximately two years, considering that major dam construction is required. SHP is the most suitable to connecting grids and providing electricity to remote areas. UNIDO, in collaboration

² Person responsible for report content

with the Ministry of Energy and Mines (MEM) has implemented 300 KW project in Burundi. The mini-grid is still now operational.

UNIDO conducted a pre-feasibility study during PPG stage at these ten sites to verify the estimated power potential at these sites in April 2016. The study estimated that there is a good potential for small hydropower generation of 20-500 MW in these locations. During the visit, it was found out that some of the sites have been already installed with SHP plants, but were out of operation due to various reasons.

A significant difficulty faced by these sites was that, either identified small hydropower sites did not have sufficient load centres or the load centres were too far away. The table 1 shows the list of identified sites and their estimated capacities.

Table1.

Identified SHP sites for scale up.

s. N.o.	Name of the water course	Project location	Estimated power generation potential, KW	Area to be electrified
1	Waga	Bihomvora, Bisoro commune ,Mwaro Province	240	Kanka, Masango, Nyarusange
2	Gikuka	Gitaba, Vugizo Commune, Makamba Province	500	Mpinga, kaviru, Gishiha, Vugizo and vugizo market
3	Muyovozi	Karindo, Rutana Commune, Rutana Province	180	Musongati and Kayero
4	Nyamwondo	Nyamwondo, Mwakiro Commune, Musinga Province	100	Gisimbawaga and mwakiro
	TOTAL		1,020	

The study also identified some existing barriers for SHP technology in the country. The institutional support is nearly non-existent and the different ministries have many overlapping areas. <it is also noted here that all the grid connected power plants are public owned plants only. And such, there is no hydropower policy in the country on generation licenses, power purchase agreements (PPA), grid connection, wheeling, etc. Lack of effort is also identified at all levels for local capacity development both on site assessments and manufacture of SHP technology.

In summary, the baseline project activities show there are serious efforts going on to increase utilization of hydropower in Burundi. The proposed project could use this momentum to achieve its objectives and target effectively. Though baseline project activities are focussed on hydropower plants with 1.020 MW total capacity, the proposed project could benefit from the lessons learnt, challenges faced and gaps in technical capabilities in the implementation of hydropower projects in the country. Thus the baseline projects indicate appositve influence on the project activities.

Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and select corresponding ratings for the current reporting period, i.e. FY22. Please also provide a short justification for the selected ratings for FY22.

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

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

and circumstances or understanding. In order to facilitate with this assessment, please introduce the ratings as reported in the previous reporting cycle, i.e. FY21, in the last column.

Overall Ratings⁴	FY22	FY21
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory (U)</i>
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Substantial Risk (S)</i>	<i>Substantial Risk (S)</i>

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.

Project Strategy	KPIs/Indicators	Baseline	Target level	Progress in FY22
Component 1 – Component 1 – Human and institutional capacity building on SHP technology, energy policy and planning				
Outcome 1: Outcome 1.1: improved knowledge base and strengthened national policy on SHP				
Output 1.1: Output 1.1.1: Key policymakers and other stakeholders (at least 30 in each group) trained	Number of trained policy makers and other stakeholders	Low number of trained people	Train at least 150 policy makers and other stakeholders	No new progress to date. The benchmarking tour to Uganda that was planned was postponed. It has been rescheduled to take place from 23-26 August 2022
Output 1.2: Output 1.1.2: Institutional set up strengthened for suitable management of mini-grid	Capacity of ABR and REGIDESO for effective and sustainable management of mini-grids improved	No improvement actions realised	Improved capacity for ABR and REGIDESO or effective and sustainable management of mini-grids	No new progress to date, however, terms of reference to conduct a GIS mapping exercise to identify potential mini-grid sites in the country has been developed.
Output 1.1.3: Relevant institutions and national policy on SHP strengthened	Policy summary report including a recommendation	Few institutions with limited capacity to	Prepared policy summary report including a recommendation	No new progress to date, however, terms of reference to conduct a study on the existing tariff structure and legal framework for deploying off-grid

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

	for an improved policy and strengthening of institutions for facilitating SHP business in the country prepared Capacity of ABR and REGIDESO to develop and manage a large network of decentralized mini-grid network of SHP in the country strengthened	promote SHP technology	for an improved policy and strengthening of institutions for facilitating SHP business in the country Strengthened capacity of ABR and REGIDESO to develop and manage a large network of decentralized mini-grid network of SHP in the country	public-private-partnership energy systems in Burundi.
--	--	------------------------	---	---

Component 2 – Scaling up of SHP plants

Outcome 1: Conducive environment created for scaling up SHP plants

Output 1.1: Output 2.1.1: Detailed plant designs prepared for accumulative capacity of 1 MW SHP	Technical designs and business plans prepared	No design or business plan prepared	Prepared technical designs and business plans	Feasibility study reports for Waga and Gikuka are available. Remaining realization of detailed study.
Output 1.2: Output 2.1.2: SHP plants for accumulative capacity of 1 MW established	SHP plants for a cumulative capacity of 1 MW established (Waga, GIKUKA? Muyovozi, Nyamwondo)	Any existing plant at the sites	Established SHP plants for a cumulative capacity of 1 MW (Waga, Gikuka, Muyovozi, Nyamyondo)	No new progress to date, however, the Project Coordination Committee (PCC) has approved the inclusion of Karonke hybrid project in the GEF project. The Karonke hybrid project is being developed by an independent power producer, Virunga Power, and has a hydro component of 600 kW.
Output 2.1.3: Centralized electronic monitoring and controlling system for decentralized SHP plants established	Automated electronic monitoring and control system installed in each of installed SHP Standardized central monitoring and control unit developed	Any installed monitoring or control system	Installed Automated electronic monitoring and control system in each of installed SHP Developed Standardized central monitoring and control unit	No new progress to date

Component 3 – Facilitation of replication projects

Outcome 1: Initiatives taken for the replication projects

Output 1.1: Output 3.1.1: SHP sites assessed for further replication	Assessment of other potential sites and availability of load centres done in order to identify further	No assessment done	Done assessment of other potential sites and availability of load centres done in order to	No new progress to date, however, a terms of reference to conduct pre-feasibility studies on 15 potential hydropower sites and assess the possibility of establishing a renewable energy and rural transformation centres around the
--	--	--------------------	--	--

	replication projects in the country		identify further replication projects in the country	potential SHP sites has been developed.
Output 1.2: Output 3.1.2: Detailed project report (DPR) and business plan developed for the replication projects to a cumulative capacity of 1.0 MW	Detailed project report (DPR) and business plan developed for the replication projects to a cumulative capacity of 1.0 MW prepared.	No DPR	Prepared detailed project report (DPR) and business plan developed for the replication projects to a cumulative capacity of 1.0 MW	No new progress to date
Output 3.1.3: Experience shared and information disseminated	Project sites visit and seminars organized and project experience disseminated to various interested stakeholders	No action undertaken	Organized project sites visit and seminars organized and disseminated project experience to various interested stakeholders	No new progress to date
Component 4:-Monitoring and Evaluation				
Outcome 4.1.: Effectiveness of the outputs assessed , corrective action taken and experience documented				
Output 4.1.1. End of project monitoring and evaluation report prepared (independent evaluation)	Independent final evaluation conducted	No action undertaken	Conducted Independent final evaluation	No new progress to date

III. Project Risk Management

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

	(i) Risks at CEO stage	(i) Risk level FY 21	(i) Risk level FY 22	(i) Mitigation measures	(ii) Progress to-date	New defined risk ⁵
1	Insufficient technical capacity for operation and maintenance	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	Burundi already has few SHP plants, whose experience will be incorporated in the proposed projects. Assistance will be provided through the proposed project to technical services such as feasibility studies, procurement of equipment and power plant operation training.	No new progress to date	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

				As already mentioned in section A.1, “under innovativeness, sustainability and scaling up”, UNIDO possesses remarkable experience in SHP in the region. UNIDO , has experience in the technology an implementation of SHP projects, especially , GEF funded projects and can influence various factors including managing the technical risk and can steer project to ensure its success		
2	a) No off-takers for the generate electricity	Moderate risk (M)	Moderate risk (M)	<p>The generated electricity will be to the small industries nearby the power plant. In general, the demand and the supply gap are wide in Burundi. Hence , there will not be any risk for the electricity off-take</p> <p>The proposed project is implemented by MHEM with participation of private sector since Karonke hybrid project is included in the GEF project. Participation. Virunga Power related risk are modest but have to be considered. However, training will be provided to national experts , renewable energy (RE)/technical institutions, banks/financial institutions, engineering companies, interested developers, NGOs/CSOs. This will boost confidence and capacity of private sector for future investment in SHP.</p>	The Project Coordination Committee (PCC) has approved the inclusion of Karonke hybrid project in the GEF project. The Karonke hybrid project is being developed by an independent power producer, Virunga Power, and has a hydro component of 600 kW. The participation of the private sector calls for consideration of its related risk that is considered as modest risk. Virunga Power is experienced in realization of the similar projects in the region.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Lack of human capacity to operate the SHP plants	Moderate risk (M)	Moderate risk (M)	All the SHP plants management and O&M staff will be trained by the respective equipment suppliers. In addition, training will be given through the proposed project to strengthen the capacity of local engineering and O&M companies	No new progress to date	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Drought, flood and silting	Moderate risk (M)	Moderate risk (M)	Feasibility study and design of the scale up projects will consider the historical rain patterns and intensity. Based	No new progress to date	<input type="checkbox"/>

				on the feasibility study report, a detailed ESMP will be developed. Spillways and diversion channels will be constructed where required to mitigate the risk of flooding as well as utilization of environmental flow devices to address fish passages.		
5	Lack of interest, thus underrepresentation from the specific stakeholder groups	Substantial risk (S)	Substantial risk (S)	This project will pursue thorough and gender responsive communication and ensure stakeholder involvement at all levels, with special regard to involving women and men as well as CSOs and NGOs promoting gender equity and empowerment of women (GEEW), and a gender expert. This will mitigate the social and gender-related risks, promote gender equity, create a culture of mutual acceptance, and maximize the potential contribution of the project in improving gender equity in the energy field.	Stakeholder participation has been challenging therefore increased risk level from low to substantial.	<input type="checkbox"/>
6	Unstable political conditions	High risk (H)	High risk (H)	UNIDO will carefully keep tracking the political conditions in the country. Agreements will be signed with the government of Burundi/MEM to ensure implementation of project activities as per plan. UNIDO's international experience in handling such projects in developing countries will help to overcome this risk.	Government interest in the project has been insufficient therefore increased risk level from moderate to high.	

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.

During the period of the PIR, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has significantly reduced. The borders were opened so that the travel becomes easier. The COVID-19 contaminations were significantly reduced. The negative impact of the pandemic is insignificant.

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

The project is facing delays in its implementation. The main reason is the lack of co-financing. The project had its first extension that ended on 31 March 202, a further nine months extension that ends on 31 December 2022 has been approved. A list of activities and timeline for that period has been developed and agreed by the government and UNIDO. The completion of those activities will justify an extension for 2.5-3 years or the non-completion of all the milestones will warrant the closure of the project by UNIDO.

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 Project Mid-Term Review was conducted in Q1 2021. The main recommendations are as follows:

- 1. Co-sign the project document between the Government and UNIDO and officially launch the implementation of the revised project*
- 2. Inform the Ministry of Finance about the signed summarized document*
- 3. Schedule the realization of feasibility studies on the 4 sites as quickly as possible and prioritize their sequential constructions over time given, the funds progressively mobilized while funding mechanism to avoid the constraints linked to COVID-19 pandemic.*
- 4. Consider and put in place fundraising strategy for the revised and reoriented project, especially since the Government is committed to supporting the continuation of the project which involves UNIDO, the private sector and possibly other Technical and Financial partners.*

Specific actions were taken towards implementing the recommendations

- 1. The project document has been signed by both parties :Government(Ministry in charge of Energy and the Minister of finance) and UNIDO*
- 2. Feasibility studies were conducted for two (Gikuka and Waga) of the four sites*
- 3. Discussions have been engaged with VIRUNGA Power in the aim to collaborate for the project realization.*

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).

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	The risks identified in the ESMP are related to the development of the identified sites and are listed as follows: i. Erosion of the	The ESMP has been achieved and the report exists. Mitigation measures will be taken during the realization of the project referring to the EIA report recommendations.	NA

	top soil and reservoir sedimentation ii. Loss of wildlife habitat, flora and fauna iii. Displacement of people iv. Deterioration in water quality v. Change in water quantity in downstream vi. Loss of productive land, historical and cultural sites		
(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 coordinating and monitoring committee held two meetings. The members of PCMC are representatives of the key stakeholders from Government and private sector. The Ministry of finance funded the visits by the PCMC of the 15 selected sites. The preparation of the activity is on-going at the directorate general of energy.

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 PCMC agreed on the collaboration with Virunga Power for the realization of the Karonke site. UNIDO was allowed to discuss with Virunga Power for the development of the Karonke site.

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

List of the documents which will be submitted in addition to the report, e.g.:

- Project coordinating and monitoring Committee meetings minutes
- Aide Memoire for the benchmarking tour
- Summarized project document
- Feasibility studies for Gikuka and Waga.

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).

One woman is member of the coordinating and monitoring committee.

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.

NA.

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

NA.

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.

-The main challenge remains the availability of co-financing. The steering and monitoring committee has authorised a grant of USD 850,000 and UNIDO to discuss with Virunga Power for the joint realization of the Karonke Hydropower and solar project.

-The main realizations are as follows:

- Signing of the summarized project document
- Feasibility studies for Gikuka and Waga sites
- Grant from the Ministry of Finance for the visits of the sites

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	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Components and Cost	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Financial Management	<i>The steering and monitoring committee has authorised a grant of USD 850,000 for equipment to Virunga Power for the joint realization of the Karonke Hydropower and solar project.</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	<i>Need of extension</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity Category	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor Project Objective Change	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Safeguards	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk Analysis	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Co-Financing	<i>The participation of Virunga Power is estimated USD 600,000</i>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Location of Project Activities	<i>Introduction of the new site of Karonke with collaboration of Virunga Power</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others	

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

<p><i>Main expenditures:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Staff and international consultants</i> - <i>Local travel</i> - <i>Nat. consultants/staff</i> - <i>Contractual services</i> - <i>Train/fellowship/study</i> - <i>Other direct costs</i>
--

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.

<i>N.</i>	<i>Task</i>	<i>Activities</i>	<i>Timelines</i>	<i>Milestone</i>	<i>Budget (USD)</i>
1	<i>Benchmarking tour for policy</i>	<i>-Nomination participants</i>	<i>of August 2022</i>	<i>Action plan on private sector</i>	<i>25,000</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%.

	<i>and decision-makers in Burundi</i>	<i>-logistic preparation -Realisation of the activity</i>		<i>participation/engagement in small hydropower and other RE resources IPPs development</i>	
2	<i>Analysis of cost-reflective tariff</i>	<i>-Recruitment of expert -Realization of the analysis by the expert -Submission of the draft report -Submission of the final report</i>	<i>September 2022</i>	<i>Approved cost reflective tariff for small scale power producers</i>	
3	<i>Conduct further studies such as geotechnical, topographical survey, analysis of cost-effective tariff and detailed Environmental Social Impact Assessment (ESIA)</i>	<i>- Contract with BRL for the realization of the studies - Conduct of the studies by BRL - Submission of the reports - Analyse of draft reports - Submission of final reports</i>	<i>August- November 2022</i>	<i>Bankable detailed project report with environmental social management plan (ESMP)</i>	
4	<i>Confirmation of private sector participation</i>	<i>- Discussion between UNIDO and Virunga Power - Signature of the agreement</i>	<i>October 2022</i>	<i>Pre-agreement with the GoB to utilize the GEF grant to develop the Karonke site in collaboration of Virunga Power</i>	<i>USD 850,000</i>
6	<i>Conduct the replication study for the 15 selected sites</i>	<i>-Recruitment of expert -Realization of the analysis by the expert -Submission of the draft report -submission of the final report</i>	<i>November 2022</i>	<i>Replication study report</i>	
7	<i>Provide the network planning software isolated from Burundi</i>	<i>- Draft terms of reference - Recruitment of the provider - Provide the network software</i>	<i>August 2022</i>	<i>Financing of network planning software isolated from Burundi</i>	
8	<i>Visit of the 15 selected sites for replication</i>	<i>-Logistic preparation of the visits -Realization of the visits</i>	<i>September 2022</i>	<i>Budget provided by the Ministry of Finance</i>	
10	<i>Extend the project by 2.5-3 years if the above</i>	<i>-Preparation of the file for the extension request -Submit the request</i>	<i>December 2022</i>	<i>Approval of the extension by the GEF CU</i>	

	<i>milestones have been achieved</i>	<i>-Approval of the request</i>			
--	--	---------------------------------	--	--	--

X. Synergies

1. **Synergies** achieved:

NA.

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

NA.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. **Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period, i.e. 1 July 2021 – 30 June 2022.
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 is <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.