



## Project Implementation Report

(1 July 2023 – 30 June 2024)

Project Title:	Promotion of small hydropower (SHP) for productive use and energy services in Burundi
GEF ID:	9056
UNIDO ID:	140332
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	GEF-6
Country(ies):	Burundi.
Region:	AFR - Africa
GEF Focal Area:	Climate Change Adaptation (CCA)
Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs <sup>1</sup> :	N/A
Stand-alone / Child Project:	N/A
Implementing Department/Division:	Choose an item. IET/CTP
Co-Implementing Agency:	N/A
Executing Agency(ies):	Ministry of Hydraulics, Energy and Mines
Project Type:	Full-Sized Project (FSP)
Project Duration:	48
Extension(s):	2
GEF Project Financing:	USD 1,575,155
Agency Fee:	USD 149,640
Co-financing Amount:	USD 6,530,000
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	6/5/2017
UNIDO Approval Date:	7/26/2017
Actual Implementation Start:	8/8/2019
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2024:	USD 1,313,9384
Mid-term Review (MTR) Date:	4/20/2021
Original Project Completion Date:	7/25/2021

<sup>1</sup> Only for GEF-6 projects, if applicable

<b>Project Completion Date as reported in FY23:</b>	6/30/2025
<b>Current SAP Completion Date:</b>	6/30/2025
<b>Expected Project Completion Date:</b>	3/31/2025
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation (TE) Date:</b>	3/31/2025
<b>Expected Financial Closure Date:</b>	3/31/2025
<b>UNIDO Project Manager<sup>2</sup>:</b>	Liu Heng

## I. Brief description of project and status overview

<b>Project Objective</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>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 tCO<sub>2</sub>e; and (iv) facilitating a conducive investment environment leading to replication of at least 4 MW and overall indirect savings of 126,144 tCO<sub>2</sub>e.</p>

<b>Baseline</b>
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

<sup>2</sup> Person responsible for report content

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 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 Table 1.

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, kavyiru, Gishiha, Vugizo and vugizo market
3	Muyovozi	Karindo, Rutana Commune, Rutana Province	180	Musongati and Kayero
4	Nyamwondo	Nyamwondo, Mwakiro Commune, Muyinga 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 appositive 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. FY24. Please also provide a short justification for the selected ratings for FY24.

In view of the GEF Secretariat's intent to start following the ability of projects to adopt the concept of adaptive management<sup>3</sup>, 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

<sup>3</sup> 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. FY23, in the last column.

Overall Ratings <sup>4</sup>	FY24	FY23
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>
<i>Environmental objectives of the project have been completed, with full ESIA conducted on the two development ready sites. Detailed environment and social impact assessment have been completed, with developer moving forward with civil works and construction of the small hydropower plants planned in the sites.</i>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
<i>Project implementation is progressing moderately, with all contractual arrangements well in place for full site development. Project team is closely monitoring implementation together with the government Ministry and power utility.</i>		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>
<i>Overall project risks remain moderate. Only drawback to project timely completion and development is the pace at which service provider and power utility completes the site development. Project management team shall ensure to mitigate every foreseen risk, and as needed implement mitigation mechanisms.</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 FY24
<b>Component 1 – Human and institutional capacity building on SHP technology, energy policy and planning Co</b>				
Outcome 1: improved knowledge base and strengthened national policy on SHP				
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
Output 1.1.2: Institutional set up strengthened for	Capacity of ABR and REGIDESO for effective and	No improvement actions realised	Improved capacity for ABR and REGIDESO	No new progress to date

<sup>4</sup> 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

suitable management of mini-grid Output 1.2:	sustainable management of mini-grids improved		or effective and sustainable management of mini-grids	
Output 1.1.3: Relevant institutions and national policy on SHP strengthened	Policy summary report including a recommendation 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	Few institutions with limited capacity to promote SHP technology	Prepared policy summary report including a recommendation 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	No new progress to date
<b>Component 2 – Scaling up of SHP plants</b>				
Outcome 2: Conducive environment created for scaling up SHP plants				
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	BRLi has already presented the inception and intermediate reports for Waga and Gikuka sites.
Output 2.1.2: SHP plants for accumulative capacity of 1 MW established Output 1.2:	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)	The process for the inclusion of Karonke hybrid project in the GEF project is on-going. Virunga Power (a partner of the Weza Utility in Burundi) received the needed authorization for the implementation of the hybrid project and submitted the implementation programme. UNIDO has contracted Virunga Power and shared with Virunga the agreement to countersign for the project. Environmental and social impact assessments studies were also carried out by a local CICESE consultancy. UNIDO reviewed the reports and suggested areas of improvements in terms of grievances redress and risks mitigation in development sites.
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	Any installed monitoring or control system	Installed Automated electronic monitoring and control system in each of installed SHP	No new progress to date

	Standardized central monitoring and control unit developed		Developed Standardized central monitoring and control unit	
<b>Component 3 – Facilitation of replication projects</b>				
Outcome 3: Initiatives taken for the replication projects				
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 replication projects in the country	No assessment done	Done assessment of other potential sites and availability of load centres done in order to identify further replication projects in the country	Pre-feasibility studies have been carried out at four of fifteen identified sites. Following by two (2) detailed ESIA fully completed with the support of the GEF funded Project. The Directorate-General of Energy (Ministry) and UNIDO are closely following progress of development ready sites.
Output 3.1.2: Detailed project report (DPR) and business plan developed for the replication projects to a cumulative capacity of 1.0 MW Output 1.2:	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	No new progress to date
Output 3.1.3: Experience shared and information disseminate	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
<b>Component 4: -Monitoring and Evaluation</b>				
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	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 23	(i) Risk level FY 24	(i) Mitigation measures	(ii) Progress to-date	New defined risk <sup>5</sup>
1	Insufficient technical capacity for operation and maintenance	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	No new progress to date	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	a) No off-takers for the generate electricity	Modest risk (M)	Modest 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>	No new progress to date	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Lack of human capacity to operate the SHP plants	Modest risk (M)	Modest 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	No new progress to date	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>5</sup> New risk added in reporting period. Check only if applicable.

				the capacity of local engineering and O&M companies		
4	Drought, flood and silting	Substantial risk (S)	Substantial risk (S)	This project will pursue thorough and gender responsive communication an 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 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.	No new progress to date	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	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 counties will help to overcome this risk	No new progress to date	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

N/A

N/A.

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

N/A

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

*MTR noted the project delays, which was attributed to the lack of government co-financing to civil works for the full sites' development. However, after partnering with Virunga Power Ltd. (a power prosumer) of the national utility which provides co-funding to the civil works of the hydropower development, the construction is in full swing.*

#### IV. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)



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

Category A project

Category B project

Category C project

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

*Notes on new risks:*

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

Please expand the table as needed.

	<b>E&amp;S risk</b>	<b>Mitigation measures undertaken during the reporting period</b>	<b>Monitoring methods and procedures used in the reporting period</b>
<b>(i)</b> Risks identified in ESMP at time of CEO Endorsement	Erosion of the topsoil and reservoir sedimentation	The avoidance of unnecessary clearing of vegetation around plants, and restricted vehicle movement in catchment area.	Erosion shall be mitigated in coordination with environment ministry supervision of construction and the developer follow guidance form EIA for each site.
	Loss of aquatic habitat, flora, and fauna, and Fish injury due to plant design	Detailed designs of plants in run of river, with minimal environmental impact to the land, and aquatic habitat. Where foreseen, designs of plant shall address accordingly.	PMU shall work with the utility to ensure the preservation of habitat, including its considerations in details hydropower plant designs.
	Displacement of people	A detailed ESIA and associated stakeholders plans was discussed with stakeholders. Grievance redress mechanisms were prepared to address up to 80 households in both sites.	Directorate of Energy overseeing that the grievances redress are conducted in accordance with plans.
<b>(ii)</b> New risks identified during project implementation (if not applicable, please insert 'NA' in each box)	Change in water quantity in downstream Deterioration in water quality Loss of productive land, historical and cultural sites	Project ESIA addresses water-energy-farming and agriculture nexus, including those affecting farming  No cultural/historical sites were affected or is envisaged to be affected.	The Ministry of Agriculture in coordination with local PMU overseeing local farmers relocated to different farmlands downstream and provided seeding for crop replanting.

## 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).

No new progress to date

*No new progress to date*

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.).

*Virunga Power submitted his working programme for the Karonke project. Discussions for UNIDO participation are at an advanced stage.*

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

*Please list here the documents which will be submitted in addition to the report, e.g.:*

- *Project Steering Committee minutes*

## 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),.

*No new progress to date.*

## VII. Knowledge Management and Communication

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

*N/A.*

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

*N/A.*

## 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 studies of social and environmental carried out by the local CICESE office are advanced. The inception and interim reports validation workshops were organized.

BRLi reports of the inception and interim DPR studies are available

2. Please briefly elaborate on any **minor amendments**<sup>6</sup> 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	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Components and Cost	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Management	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity Category	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor Project Objective Change	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Safeguards	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk Analysis	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-Financing	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Location of Project Activities	N/A
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others	N/A

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

*Main expenditures:*

- *Staff and international consultants*
- *Local travel*
- *Nat. consultants/staff*
- *Contractual services*
- *Other direct costs*

## 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.

### **Project: “Promotion of Small Hydro Power (SHP) for productive use and energy services in Burundi”**

#### **Work Plan 2024-2025**

<b>Activities</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>Budget</b>
-------------------	-------------	-------------	---------------

<sup>6</sup> 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	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	
<b>Component 1-Human and institutional capacity building on SHP technology, energy policy and planning</b>									
<b>Outcome 1: improved knowledge base strengthened national policy on SHP</b>									
<b>Output 1.1 key policy makers and other stakeholders (at least 30 each group) trained</b>									
1. Training on PPP principles and procedures for the stakeholders									30 000
<b>Component 2 -Scaling up of SHP plants</b>									
<b>Output 2.1: Detailed plant designs prepared for a cumulative capacity of 1.0 MW SHP plants</b>									
2. Development of detailed design and ESIA studies and development of the ESMP for two potential small hydropower Waga & Gikuka sites in Burundi.									20 000
3. Follow up the implementation step for the construction of Waga and Gikuka sites in PPP models									30 000
<b>Output 2.2:SHP plants for a cumulative capacity of 1.0 MW established</b>									
4. Construction of Karonke 850 kW hybrid project by Virunga Power.									550 000
<b>Component 3-Facilitation of replication projects</b>									
<b>Outcome 3.1: initiative taken for the replication projects</b>									
<b>Output 3.1:SHP sites assessed for replication projects</b>									
5. Continuous dialogue with the Government in the identification and the contact of partners for co-financing and supervise the feasibility studies of 11 hydropower sites and allow private sector participation.									
<b>6. Component 4-Monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E)</b>									
<b>7. Outcome 4.1: Effectiveness of the outputs assessed, corrective actions taken and experience documented</b>									
8. Follow up the monthly and regular meetings									
9. Continuous monitoring of Karonke hybrid site Waga and Gikuka									27 000
10. Follow up and participate to the meetings of the project Coordinating and monitoring Committee									5 000
11. Follow up the reporting with detailed information on the project's progress according to the annual implementation plan and activities carried out during each implementation period.									10 000
12. Recruit the evaluation team									25 000
13. Conduct the terminal evaluation									5 000

<b>Project Management costs</b>								
14. Project Management staff								<b>100 000</b>
15. Printing of achievement brochure and develop project documentary								<b>15 000</b>
16. Management of office space								<b>5 000</b>
17. Contingencies								<b>10 000</b>
18. Close the project								<b>15 000</b>
19. TOTAL BUDGET								<b>842 000</b>

## X. Synergies

1. **Synergies** achieved:

N/A.
------

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

N/A.
------

## XI. GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The identified project sites location names:

**Gikuka** ( 3°40'58.1"S (-3.6828000°) Latitude and Longitude 29°54'18.4"E (29.9051000°);

Gikuka is located in the region of [Gitega](#). Gitega's capital [Gitega](#) (Gitega) is approximately [28 km](#) / 18 mi away from Gikuka. Waga Stream - a body of running water moving to a lower level in a channel on land

**Waga** latitude 3° 30' 47" S, longitude 29° 51' 1" E. Descriptions of both Gikuka and Waga are clearly indicated in the completed ESIA's, as attached to this PIR.

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location and Activity Description
Gikuka	-3.6828000°	29.9051000°		SHP site under development
Waga	-03.5130556°	29.8502778°		SHP site under development

### EXPLANATORY NOTE

- Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period, i.e. 1 July 2023 – 30 June 2024.
- Responsibility:** The responsibility for preparing the report lies with the project manager in consultation with the Division Chief and Director.
- 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.
- 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	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	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".
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	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.
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	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.
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	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.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	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.
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	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)	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	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".
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	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.
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.

<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	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.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Implementation of <u>most</u> components is <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	Implementation of <u>none</u> of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

<b>Risk ratings</b>	
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:	
<b>High Risk (H)</b>	There is a probability of greater than <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
<b>Substantial Risk (S)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>51%</b> and <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks.
<b>Moderate Risk (M)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>26%</b> and <b>50%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
<b>Low Risk (L)</b>	There is a probability of up to <b>25%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.