



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Pacific/Oceania
Country (ies):	Kiribati
Project Title:	Resilient Islands, Resilient Communities
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/KIR/009/GFF
GEF ID:	5551
GEF Focal Area(s):	BD-1, LD-3, IW-3, SFM-1
Project Executing Partners:	MELAD, MFMRD, MIA, Island Councils
Project Duration:	5 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	08 Jan 2018
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	16 Apr 2018
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	15 Apr 2023
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	
Actual Implementation End Date³:	

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	4,720,030
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	13 340 000
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	52,084
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	45,000

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	N/A
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	April 2021
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	April 2023
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	MS	
Overall implementation progress rating:	HU	
Overall risk rating:	Medium	

Status

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

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Ricardo Torres, Natural Resources Specialist, FAO Kiribati, Kiribati	Ricardo.torrescoll@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Jessica Sanders, Senior Fisheries Officer, FAOSAP, Samoa	Jessica.sanders@fao.org
Budget Holder	Eriko Hibi, FAO Sub-Regional Coordinator for the Pacific Islands, FAOSAP, Samoa	Eriko.Hibi@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Naito Yurie, Funding Liaison Officer, FAO HQ, Rome	Yurie.Naito@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): improve biodiversity conservation and landscape level management to enhance socio-ecological resilience to climate variability and change.						
Outcome 1: Enabling environment improved for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources	Capacity strengthening to enhance cross-sector enabling environment.	Inadequate capacities for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources	* Cross sectoral mechanisms and community participation/stakeholder engagement model formally operationalized/implemented by end project Y2 * R2R school, outreach and extension programmes designed by end project Y2	* National and island level cross-sectoral mechanisms effectively engaging men and women stakeholders and facilitating coordinated R2R decision making in target areas by project end * R2R school, outreach and extension programmes emphasizing gender equity established in target areas, with regular trainings conducted for communities and Government staff (cross-sectoral training courses addressing cross-sectoral issues conducted) by project end	Initial awareness raised	N/A (project start delayed)
	Framework strengthening integrated natural resource management	Weak cross-sectoral framework for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation	Relevant priorities/policies/legal frameworks revised/drafted by end project Y2	INRM framework emphasizing gender equity formally proposed by project end	INRM framework has been discussed	N/A (project start delayed)

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

⁹ 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) ¹⁰	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹¹	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ¹²
Objective(s): improve biodiversity conservation and landscape level management to enhance socio-ecological resilience to climate variability and change.						
Outcome 2: National management system for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources established to deliver SFM, LD, and BD benefits	Spatial coverage of integrated natural resource management practices in wider landscapes	Nil - Very limited integrated land and marine management practices implemented across wider landscapes		23,477 ha with integrated natural resource management (land and marine) practices adopted by local communities by project end		N/A (project start delayed)
Outcome 3: Project implementation based on results based management and application and sharing of project findings and lessons learned	Project annual workplans and progress reports reflect lessons learnt and recommendations from monitoring and evaluation exercises and R2R meetings	N/A		Each annual workplan and progress report reflects lessons learnt and recommendations from M&E exercises until project end	Project information to be shared at the regional R2R meeting in 2019	N/A (project start delayed)
	Project Steering Committee and R2R regional meetings and networks updated on project implementation, achievements and lessons learnt with relevant reports shared	N/A		Annual Project Steering Committee and R2R meetings updated on project implementation, achievements and lessons learnt, with relevant communication materials developed throughout project life	Inception workshop and first PSC are now being planned	N/A (project start delayed)

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ 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.

¹² 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)**.

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹³

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: Enabling environment improved for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources	Quick recruitment and work planning to move forward delayed activities.	PSC for decision making Implementation by CTA, NPC, LTO	Once PMU and PSC are set up (within 2 months)
Outcome 2: National management system for ecosystem-based sustainable use and conservation of island resources established to deliver SFM, LD, and BD benefits	Quick recruitment and work planning to move forward delayed activities.	PSC for decision making Implementation by CTA, NPC, LTO	Once PMU and PSC are set up (within 2 months)
Outcome 3: Project implementation based on results based management and application and sharing of project findings and lessons learned	Activities under Outcome 3 can only happen when the project has produced some synergies among stakeholders	PSC for decision making Implementation by CTA, NPC, LTO, FLO	At the end of first year of implementation

¹³ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹⁴	Expected completion date ¹⁵	Achievements at each PIR ¹⁶					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁷ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1: R2R concept mainstreamed into sectoral development priorities, legal framework and policies with an emphasis on protecting and developing livelihoods	Q2 Y2						0%	Project implementation in very early stages
Output 1.1.2: National level coordination mechanism developed for cross-sectoral decision-making (including on PAs)	Q3 Y2						0%	Project implementation in very early stages
Output 1.1.3: Resilience and socio-ecological planning for national to island-level coordination mechanism on whole-of-Island based R2R conservation and sustainable-use strategies streamlined across national and islands levels	Q1 Y2	Collaboration on resilience indicators initiated with complementary projects and initiatives					5%	Project implementation in very early stages
Output 1.1.4: National and island level environmental education, outreach and extension programme developed	Q3 Y2						0%	Project implementation in very early stages
Output 2.1.1 R2R conservation and sustainable use strategies initiated in three islands in aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems	Q4 Y2						0%	Project implementation in very early stages

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹⁶ 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)

¹⁷ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Output 2.1.2 Expanded and complementary livelihoods developed as a part of the plans developed under Output 2.1.1	Q4 Y2						0%	Project implementation in very early stages
Output 2.1.3 R2R conservation and use strategies across land and sea implemented at three target islands (through the integrated plans)	Q1 Y4	Initial assessment of community engagement in one outer island					5%	Project implementation in very early stages
Output 2.1.4 At least three PAs established (where identified in Outputs 2.1.1)	Q2 Y3						0%	Project implementation in very early stages
Output 3.1.1 Monitoring, evaluation and reporting plan and system for the project established and operational	Q1 Y4	M&E system is established					20%	Project implementation in very early stages
Output 3.1.2 Project related 'knowledge' captured and shared	Q4 Y5	Brochure of the project produced and distributed					5%	Project implementation in very early stages

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

Recruitment of an international project coordinator has been completed (June 2019) and recruitment of a National Project Coordinator is almost finalized (July 23 2019). National technical experts will be hired shortly in collaboration with partners. Planning for the inception workshop and PSC is now taking place and will be completed by Q3. In addition, a workplan for a gender strategy has been developed and will be implemented in the next three months.

Visits conducted to Tarawa were conducted in May 2017, 2018 and February 2019 with different FAO team components (SAP SRC, Fisheries Officer, GEF Program Officer, M&E Officer and Operations Officer) in order to initiate activities and define actions to be taken by implementing partners (MELAD, MFMRD, MIA, etc.). Information was shared on project expectations and duties to be taken by each partner.

Based on FAO experiences in the country, it is usually the initial one year which could be most challenging. In this regard, the fact that the project was able to reach an agreement with the primary hosting institution is a positive outcome and the efforts made to reach that point is anticipated to maintain the forward looking momentum in the coming period.

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

Unfortunately, challenges with implementing partners have been ongoing and the creation of the PMU has only recently been accepted and moved forward by the primary host institution. After the last mission in February 2019, an agreement was reached, and the project is now able to move forward. Initial recruitments and procurements are now taking place and the inception workshop will take place shortly.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁸	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁹	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	HU	<i>The Project took some time to start, however, with assistance from SAP colleagues and the LTO, several core meetings and consultations have been undertaken with key partner Ministries over the last year. The LTO has conducted three two visits to the island in order to reach consensus with government in order to move forward the project and did visit project sites.</i>
Budget Holder	MS	HU	<i>The project has faced a number of challenges, similar to other ongoing projects in Kiribati. However thanks to the continuous communication and advocacy by FAO staff as well as some key national partners with positive support, the project was able to reach to the stage indicated. It would be important that the next phase will be carried out with much higher speed in order to compensate the delays from the first one year.</i>
Lead Technical Officer²⁰	MS	HU	<i>Although the project has been slow to start, now that project staff are in place implementation will begin to speed up. Many of the project partners are keen to start work and will hopefully be able to quickly begin implementation. Implementation is just starting but the project should (with a revised workplan) still be able to achieve significant benefits.</i>
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	U	<i>Unfortunately, the project has been suffering from a slow start-up. Once the CTA is on board, it is important to plan accordingly how to catch up some of the lags to ensure timely delivery of the project activities/outputs. HQ team including myself will be available to provide necessary support.</i>

¹⁸ **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.

¹⁹ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

²⁰ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

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 ²¹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Moderate risk	Still applicable

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 Project Document and reflects also any new risks 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, as relevant.</i>

	Risk	Risk rating ²²	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²³	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

²¹ **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.

²² GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²³ 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 ²²	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²³	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Logistics stymie project implementation capacity	Medium	Distances are great and logistics challenging in Kiribati. The project is designed specifically to be sure adequate resources are available and focused. Pilot sites were chosen based upon the ability to generate strong models for replication	Two staff already recruited and based in Tarawa to liaise directly with government and are on site to facilitate and speed up procedures in person.	
2	Sectoral barriers and siloed thinking within government ministries and agencies remain	Substantial	The project approach is to create space for government ministries, local councils and community leaders to share information and experiences. A special “listening” session has been arranged for communities to participate in the PSC. Project staff will emphasize the merits of creating a common and unified vision and assist in taking steps towards achieving a common goals. Links between the R2R and other relevant projects (including the GEF LDCF project) will be strengthened. M&E will track and provide specific feedback on progress towards cross-sector cooperation and non-silo thinking	Initial discussions and meetings with MELAD and MFMRD for inception meeting are being developed	

	Risk	Risk rating ²²	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²³	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Island Government and community level support is not sustained, including failure of communities to follow the new rules	Medium	<p>Collaboration of local communities will be critical to achieving the objectives of the project, but the communities will need incentives to take ownership and participate in the resource management and biodiversity conservation activities. It may be difficult to reach agreement with all members of communities on management and enforcement measures.</p> <p>Extensive community consultations are built into every aspect of the project. Project sites will be selected, in large part, in places where communities demonstrate an interest and willingness to engage in project activities. Project ownership will be generated very early and economic incentives through livelihood diversification and improvement activities will be provided. The project is also working very closely with the MIA. The Ministry is responsible for supporting the activities of Island Councils.</p>	N/A	
4	Communities disengage from implementing management solutions	Substantial	Community engagement in substantive project activities coupled with in-field vocational training coupled with providing a community voice in the project steering committee will provide both the means for (i) real community engagement in the project, and (ii) monitoring perceptions and benefits being derived by the project at the community level	N/A	

	Risk	Risk rating ²²	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²³	Notes from the Project Task Force
5	Over exploited and heavily depleted zones expand and new fishing grounds are opened up without effective conservation and management measures	Medium	<p>This risk stems through unsustainable activities creeping into the project sites through external actors. The approach to address this risk would be triple pronged, one, local ownership and engagement for local level monitoring and reporting, two, through engagement of Island Councils for immediate action on transgressions and three, through providing livelihood diversification pilots</p> <p>As mentioned above, ownership and engagement of local communities is an integral part of the project. Similarly, Island Councils are key partners in the project planning and implementation processes.</p>	N/A	
6	Government support, including sustainable financing, becomes inconsistent with long term project objectives	Medium	<p>While MELAD and MFMRD have experience implementing GEF-financed and other projects, overall human resource capacity is generally low, particularly in the outer islands where government presence to look after environment management and protection, is nearly non-existent. Government budgets are fairly low, which could present problems if already low budgets are reduced due to changes in national budget allocations.</p> <p>Significant capacity-building activities, for government and stakeholders alike, are included in the project to address capacity gaps. Project management will closely monitor government budget allocations in order to flag and potential shortfalls as soon as possible, so that corrective measures can be taken as needed to ensure continued implementation of project activities</p>	N/A	

	Risk	Risk rating ²²	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²³	Notes from the Project Task Force
7	Climate change negatively impacts project outcomes	Medium	Sea level rise, storm surge, and variable rainfall patterns may cause communities to migrate to other areas, potentially disrupting community-led activities. The project is designed specifically to improve resilience to climate change. The likelihood of short-term impacts is low.	N/A	

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
Medium	Medium	There has been no significant change since the project started, therefore the rating remains the same as when project was conceived. It is expected that in the next PIRs there will be substantial change.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²⁴

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	NO	
Project Outputs	NO	

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
Project extension	<div>Original NTE: Revised NTE:</div> <div>Justification:</div>

²⁴ 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)?

The project activities are just being initiated and include, in the initial workplan, a gender baseline study and strategy. Preliminary contacts and exchange of information on this work has been done with partner organizations and local counterparts.

The project will promote the participation of women and empower them to strengthen their role in planning and decision-making, and improve their productivity, incomes, and living conditions. At the institutional level, adequate consideration of gender issues will be promoted through adherence of international instruments.

At the community level, participation of women will be particularly promoted in the community groups supported/established by the project, by ensuring that women make up at least 30% of the members. The project will also facilitate women's access to training and technical assistance. Training programmes delivered through the project will ensure that at least 30% of the participants are women. Data will be disaggregated by gender to monitor for the differential impacts of the project and female beneficiaries will be involved and represented in all project activities. Women will make up at least 30% of the beneficiaries of the project.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

As noted during project development, the i-Kiribati are the majority in Kiribati. The entire project is designed to support indigenous communities. The inception phase which is now starting will work very closely with individual outer island councils and communities to prepare appropriate and inclusive workplans. Given the existing consultative systems in Kiribati, project activities cannot be carried out without FPIC of local communities.

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))

Confusion in understanding FAO procedures for project implementation has contributed to delays in the starting implementation. Full stakeholder engagement at different levels will now be initiated and issues can be clarified to ensure that all partners understand their role and commitments. With the recruitments of FAO staff based in Tarawa, this situation should improve and will be more fluid through the next coming months.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- Initial awareness materials have been produced. Further information for a variety of stakeholder groups as well as articles on activities and communities will be produced in 2019.



RESILIENT ISLANDS,
RESILIENT COMMUNIT

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁵	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	MELAD	In-kind	5,650,000	15,000		5,650,000
Government	MELAD	Cash	350,000	0		350,000
Government	MFMRD	In-kind	6,000,000	10,000		6,000,000
International Organization	University of Wollongong	Cash	378,000	0		378,000
International Organization	SPC	In-kind	152,000	0		152,000
International Organization	SPC	Cash	10,000	0		10,000
International Organization	FAO	In-kind	250,000	20,000		250,000
International Organization	FAO TCP (Agriculture)	Cash	300,000	0		300,000
International Organization	FAO TCP (Fisheries)	Cash	250,000	0		250,000
		TOTAL	13,340,000	45,000		13,340,000

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

Delay of project implementation will result in the late start to co-financing.

²⁵ Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/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.