


FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report
2021 – Revised Template

Period covered 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021


1. Basic Project Data
General Information

Region:	Africa				
Country (ies):	Burundi				
Project Title:	Food-IAP: Support for sustainable food production and enhancement of food security and climate resilience in Burundi's highlands				
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/BDI/040/GFF				
GEF ID:	9178				
GEF Focal Area(s):	Multi Focal Area: IAP Food Security, Climate change, Biodiversity, Land Degradation				
Project Executing Partners:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burundian office of Environment Protection (OBPE) • Rural Engineering Department (GR) • Burundi Geographic Institute (IGEBU) • Institute of Agronomic Sciences of Burundi (ISABU), • General Direction of Environment, Water Resources and Sanitation • Bioversity International, • 3 Provincial Office of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock, • 2 local NGOs : ADISCO, APROCUVI, • UNIPROBA for FPIC. 				
Project Duration:	5 years				
Project coordinates: (Ctrl+Click here)	N o.	Colline	Coordinates		
			Latitude	Longitude	Altitude
	1	Mpehe	786352	9635588	1957.41
	2	Busimba	786187	9639544	2097.8
	3	Kibogoye	786044	9641310	2058.06
	4	Biganda	792136	9640961	1967.7
	5	Masango	795844	9639191	1686.79
	6	Busekera	785279	9641712	2206.49
	7	Shumba	789703	9642213	1925.68
	8	Gikonge	795026	9641501	1921.42
	9	Nkonyovu	802521	9635628	1621.65
	10	Nyamitwenzi	801736	9632129	1778.41
	11	Gashingwa	804834	9630817	1859.36

2021 Project Implementation Report

1	2	Gisirtye	817602	9623724	1636.81
1	3	Iteka	816028	9621816	1630.96
1	4	Kirambi	815907	9619298	1686.19
1	5	Taba	815361	9617286	1828.13
1	6	Gitaramuka	815886	9616490	1691.54
1	7	Kibogoye	815571	9614128	1645.41
1	8	Murama	809540	9615313	1706.19
1	9	Muyebe	809752	9613419	1697.69
2	0	Gitunga	811283	9612767	1688.83
2	1	Kibenga-Migende	807147	9610588	1728.18
22		Ndava	807801	9626999	1929.3
23		Nyamurenge	811964	9632934	1656.56
24		Nyabisaka	814122	9631542	1582.25
25		Ngoro	814073	9629560	1608.52
26		Nyamugari	815018	9633038	1582.99
27		Rweru	813658	9634413	1650.48
28		Kibimba	812479	9634473	1640.37
29		Gisuru	818505	9627268	1622.07
30		Bwoga	820850	9623257	1613.51
31		Rutoke	818104	9615021	1605.71
32		Butamuheba	821214	9620109	1612.2
33		Mungwa	820788	9618287	1609.42
34		Rweza	818603	9621418	1663.54
35		Mugitega	823727	9645889	1544.63
36		Mukoro	823120	9645844	1541.07

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	04 April 2017
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	04 September 2017

Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	05 September 2023
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	NA
Actual Implementation End Date³:	NA

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	7,396,330
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	45,050,728
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):	\$ 2,978,875
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021⁵	23,200,000

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	May 2021
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	September-December 2020
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	-
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	No

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.

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

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	4 th PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Salvator NDABIRORERE, NPM, FAOBI	Salvator.Ndabirorere@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Anne Sophie POISOT/ Stefano Mondovi	AnneSophie.Poisot@fao.org Stefano.Mondovi@fao.org
Budget Holder	Isaias ANGUE OBAMA, FAOR Burundi	Isaias.AngueObama@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Paola Palestini, FAO-GEF	Paola.Palestini@fao.org

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

2. 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 2021	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): To increase adoption of resilient, improved production systems for sustainable food security and nutrition through integrated landscape management and sustainable food value chains	(i) % households suffering from moderate +severe food insecurity in intervention microcatchments	<u>Moderate</u> : 74% (male led HH), 76% (female led HH) <u>Severe</u> : 2 % (male led HH), 2% (female led HH) (male led HH) (HH-BAT baseline survey)	NA	(i) Moderate: 65% (male led HH), 65% female led HH) Severe: 0% (male led HH), 0% (female led HH)	To be evaluated at the end of project	
	(ii) % increasing dietary diversity among project community households (% households daily	(i) 23% (male led HH), 16% (female led HH) (ii) 5% (HH-BAT baseline survey)	NA	(ii) (a) 40% (male led HH), 35% (female led HH) (b) 15%	To be evaluated at the end of project	

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).

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ⁹
	consume (a) at least 5 different food groups, (b) animal protein (HH-BAT baseline data)					
	(iii) IAP TT LD-1 (i): Land area under effective agricultural, rangeland and pastoral management practices and/or supporting climate-smart agriculture	0 ha	NA	30,000	17 472 ha with 14323 ha of agro-forestry, and 2581 ha of reforestation	S
Outcome 1: Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms operational in supporting policy, institutional and knowledge	IAP TT LD-4 (ii): Type of mechanisms, institutions, legal and regulatory frameworks <u>Mechanisms:</u> (i) Provincial policy platforms (incl. AgBD)	<u>Mechanisms</u> i) National and Provincial GSADR existing	<u>Mechanisms</u> i) N-GSADR and P-GSADRs actively supporting INRM scaling out in Mwaro, Gitega and Muramvya (concrete actions)	<u>Mechanisms</u> i) P-GSADR has demonstrated success in scaling out INRM in 3 provinces (intersector policy	3 workshops to harmonize and scale up INRM approaches organized (1 in each target Province) with a participation of 151 stakeholders	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ⁹
sharing mechanisms for scaling out of sustainable agriculture systems and integrated natural resources management approaches				and actions etc)		
	(ii) Knowledge sharing and planning mechanism on ILM	ii) No KS or coherency across sectors on SLM/INRM scaling out approaches	ii) KS mechanisms set up and being piloted: 1 national, 3 provincial, 4 local	ii) KS mechanisms (1 national linked to WOCAT global, 3 provincial GSADR, 4 local) effectively sharing best practices on INRM and value chains.	SLM National Group (with 24 multidisciplinary technical governmental staff) in place and their capacities reinforced	MS
	<u>Legal & regulatory frameworks:</u> (iii) ILM regulatory framework	<u>Legal & regulatory frameworks:</u> iii) No ILM framework in place/piloted	<u>Legal & regulatory frameworks:</u> iii) Consultations held, including community, gender and Batwa representation, for developing harmonised guidance for implementing INRM FFS and interlinked value chains	<u>Legal & regulatory frameworks:</u> iii) Harmonised guidance in place for implementing INRM, erosion control, BD, and interlinked value chains	i) 9 Community Action Plans for 9 targeted watersheds under implementation i) Study report on NFPIC developed and now available.	S
	(iv) National FFS strategy (extent of operationalization)	iv) National FFS strategy is available but has not yet been operationalized	iv) FFS strategy partly operationalised	iv) FFS strategy fully operationalised	Road map of FFS institutionalisation under review according to the new governmental	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ⁹
					approach related to environmental agricultural and livestock policy	
	(v) Country Strategic Framework (CSIF) (applied)	v) CSIF in place but does not include INRM/landscape approaches and not effectively applied	v) Consultations held, including community, gender and Batwa representation, for planning CSIF implementation at provincial (3), communal (3) and watershed (3) levels	v) CSIF applied/ integrated in plans and budgets at provincial (3), communal (3) and watershed (3) levels	i. CSIF applied in 9 community actions plans (erosion control, agroforestry and forestry, liver bank protection)	S
Outcome 2: Increased land area and agro-ecosystems under integrated natural resources/ landscape management and supported by FFS and sustainable value chains for increased production and	i) IAP TT LD-3 (ii): Application of INRM practices in the wider landscape	i) 0 catchments	i) 9 catchments with diagnostics completed and community plans developed for INRM including enhanced ABD (at genetic, species and habitat levels)	i) 9 catchments implementing INRM with enhanced BD (at genetic, species and habitat levels)	i. Biophysical and socio-economic characterisation completed in 9 catchments ii. Land Use Systems characterisation with Collect Earth tool for 3 provinces iii. 9 Watersheds topographic maps developed (by Rural Engineering Department of MINEAGRIE) in addition to	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ⁹
sustainable livelihoods					communities vision maps	
	ii) extent of adoption of SLM/integrated landscape management practices	ii) HH-BAT baseline: shows that many farmers use advised practices but not in a systematic manner so as to improve productivity and ES (manuring 93% crop rotation 83%, agroforestry 79%, agro-sylvo-pastoral integration 75%, intercropping 68%, contour lines 56%.)	(ii) Diverse improved SLM practices adopted in a combined approach and being monitored and documented by FFS and communities in the 9 catchments	ii) Integrated agrosilvopastoral systems with well designed SLM practices effectively combined across 9 catchments and multiple benefits on livelihoods and ES documented and demonstrated ii) 30,000 ha of combined SLM practices in place by the project end plus 50,000 ha scaled up through baseline	ii.1 105 FFS located in 58 Collines of 9 catchments adopted agro-sylvo-pastoral best practices such as erosion control with 593 Km of contour lines and 7823 206 of tree plantations, improved stoves, 8135 improved composts for Soil Fertility Management . ; ii.2. Agricultural intensification with improved seed combined with good cropping practices on 40 ha (irish and sweet potatoes (20 ha), beans (15 ha),	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ⁹
				projects and watershed plans	soya and horticulture (5 ha). ii. 3 Promotion of small-scale irrigation to increase food production even during the dry season on 390 ha with 796 HH beneficiaries. ii.4 7.774.143 forestry and agroforestry plants produced, so that the project reached a covered area of 17 472 ha ii.5. Production of 69 063 bamboo plants allowed riverbank protection on 207 Km	
	iii) % of farmers producing for market (disaggregated by gender)	iii) HH-BAT baseline: 53% produce for markets of which 37% female led HHs	iii) 2,500 (>30% female headed households, 20% orphan headed households)	iii) 8,930 (> 30% female headed households, 20% orphan headed households)	1390 farmers with 853 women and 517 men produce for the market (69 %)	S

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ⁹
	iv) % farmers with improved production (disaggregated by gender)	iv) no systematic information on total yields and diversification (baseline collected through FFS)	iv) FFS monitored and demonstrating production and diversity increases compared to normal practice (+25% by 100 FFS)	iv) FFS monitored and demonstrating production and diversity increases compared to normal practice (+25% by 200 FFS)	41% of members of FFS monitored	S
	metric tons of CO2 eq avoided			<p>over a duration of 5 years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On-farm (increase in biomass/agri. crops): 28,213t CO2 eq avoided - On-farm (increase of tree cover): 97,920t CO2 eq avoided <p>The indirect benefits (over a capitalization phase of 15 years):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On-farm (increase in biomass/agri. crops): 564,266t CO2 eq avoided - On-farm (increase of tree cover): 1,958,407t CO2 eq avoided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On-farm (increase of tree cover during the reporting period): -4 304 630 t CO2 eq avoided (using the Ex-Act Carbon Balance tool) 	HS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 3: M&A framework in place and capacity of relevant institutions built capacitated in carrying-out monitoring activities and communicating experiences and impacts for informed decision making	Targeted institutions: IGEBU, OBPE, MINAGRIE, MEEATU, universities (i) Staff in concerned institutions trained and applying tools and systems for monitoring GEBs, SLM/INRM and interlinked value chains and their impacts on food and livelihood security and ecosystem services	i) 0 staff trained and applying tools for monitoring impacts	i) 80 staff trained and applying tools for monitoring multiple impacts	i) 200 staff trained and applying tools for monitoring multiple impacts	178 Governmental staff of which 62 FFS Facilitators trained – (156 men and 22 women) on different SLM monitoring and evaluation tools (LADA-WOCAT, EX-ACT, Collect Earth and DATAR)	S
	(ii) Farmers applying participatory impact monitoring tools	ii) 0 farmers applying participatory impact monitoring tools	ii) 250 farmers applying participatory impact monitoring tools and sharing results through FFS exchanges	ii) 636 farmers applying participatory impact monitoring tools and sharing results	1,260 farmers are applying participatory monitoring tools (LADA local)	HS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ⁹
	(iii) Communication strategy in place (visibility and for development) Availability of project results and communication materials in country and shared with regional Hub	iii) no information and communication materials	iii) Communication strategy in place and project experiences shared through diverse, targeted communication and technical materials (at least 6 per year) SLM/INRM impacts compiled and shared on a 6 monthly basis for discussion and decision making/planning at all levels including through project steering committee and GSADR	iii) Communication strategy effectively implemented and project experiences shared through diverse, targeted communication and technical materials (10 per year) SLM/INRM impacts compiled and shared on a 6 monthly basis and workshops to discuss findings and policy implications at provincial (3) and national levels (1) (e.g. GSADR and DPAEs) and regional hub level (2)	1. Communication strategy document developed and under implementation where: Landscape restoration flyer developed , 4 published articles, 9 community maps have been produced. 3 Exchange visits on impact FFS SLM organised	S
	Number of project reports submitted in time	0	8	15	9 reports in which 6 PPR and 3 PIR developed, approved	HS

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating ¹⁰

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>Outcome 1: Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms operational in supporting policy, institutional and knowledge sharing mechanisms for scaling out of sustainable agriculture systems and integrated natural resources management approaches</p>	<p>1. In order to revitalize the National GSADR, support from the FAO Representation will be required to request the Minister of Environmental, Agricultural and livestock to reactive this National Platform....</p> <p>2. The FFS institutionalization road map developed by the project needs to be revised and aligned to the new Government Vision.</p>	<p>1. FAOR</p> <p>2. PMU</p>	<p>1. August 2021</p> <p>2. August 2021</p>

¹⁰ To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1: Agriculture and Rural Development Sector Working Groups (GSADR) at national (1) and provincial (3) levels strengthened and watershed management committees and multi-year plans in place at project sites (9)	Continuous activity	3 at a provincial level	3 at a provincial level	3 at a provincial level	3 at a provincial level		65%	9 Watershed management committee meetings at commune level are in plan for this year
Output 1.2: Functioning multi-stakeholder knowledge sharing mechanism in place at national (1), provincial (3), and local	Continuous activity	National sharing mechanism based on SLM tools established	Data collection by applying SLM monitoring and evaluation tools	LADA reports produced by LADA project team and available for 9 watersheds	LADA reports produced by LADA project team and available for 9 watersheds		60%	9 Watershed committees are being strengthened serving as SLM/INRM

¹¹ 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.

¹² As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

¹³ 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)

¹⁴ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
(4) levels (watershed; FFS networks) and promoting exchange of experiences and lessons learned (success and failure) on scaling out SLM /INRM at landscape scale		(24 technical staff)		In which 18 communities maps are also developed by communities. 9 first maps shows the current situation of their landscapes and others 9 vision maps highlight different measures will be in place to address land degradation and to improve community livelihoods.	Collect Earth data analysis report available			knowledge sharing mechanisms at local level. Communal GSADR will be organized at watershed level, in which watershed committee members are represented. Land use systems map established and shared for the 9 watersheds of the project area.
Output 1.3: Legal and regulatory frameworks on SLM, sustainable use of agrobiodiversity and agricultural and environmental strategies and plans better known at	Q ² Y ³		9 consultation meetings and data collection in 9 watersheds	Data base on agrobiodiversity available for the 9 watersheds	Training on Agrobiodiversity data analysis held		65%	A data analysis is planned for the 3 rd quarter of this year After this activity, Development Action Plan in order to restore,

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
national (1) and provincial level (1) and applied in communal development plans and watershed management plans								to maintain and improve the agrobiodiversity at watershed level will be in place
Output 1.4: National strategy for harmonization of FFS-INRM operationalized in 3 provinces with particular attention to resilient and sustainable food and agricultural systems	Q ² Y ³	National strategy for harmonization of FFS-INRM developed	Road map for FFS national strategy operationalization undergoing	Road map for FFS national strategy operationalization undergoing : The Ministry in charge of FFS - INRM approach will create a structure to coordinate and regulate the process at national, provincial and communal level. FFS network with different partners involved on FFS approach will be in place and regular platform	The Ministry in charge of FFS - INRM approach has decided to adapt the approach to a new governmental vision focusing to outreach centers		60%	The Government has adopted a new policy and the strategy needs to be reviewed in order to be in line with the national policy.

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
				on FFS approach will be established.				
Output 1.5: Communities consulted through a participatory negotiated territorial development (PNTD) and Free prior informed consent (FPIC) process (from 2)	Q ² Y ³		A service provider is identified and a LOA is in preparation	Recruitment of a NGO which represents the Batwa is ongoing	FPIC report available		80%	One of local indigenous people associations, ADRSEPAL, has been committed to carry out the consultations
Output 2.1: Micro-watershed management plans developed and implemented (9) using combined appropriate SLM technologies and a harmonized INRM approach	Q ² Y ³	Training on LADA-WOCAT	Community consultation report on biophysical and socio economic status on 9 watersheds in going	9 watershed management plans developed	9 watershed management plans developed		80%	Watersheds actions plans are under implementation on the ground
Output 2.2: National FFS curricula (1) updated and FFS master trainers (25) and facilitators (100) trained on the job with 318 FFS groups which	Continuous	30 Facilitator trained	1. The first generation of 30 facilitators has been recycled; 2. 14 potential master trainers and 7 master	The second Training of Facilitators (ToF) has been conducted for 32 facilitators	62 facilitators have adopted and implement SLM good practices; VSLA approach and		85%	The project has currently 62 operational facilitators (54 men and 8 women)

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
are practicing and supported in SLM/ INRM at farm and watershed scale			trainers trained on climate change, adaptation mitigation and nutrition; 3. 32 new facilitators have been identified and will be trained in July 2019		smart climate agriculture			The FFS curricula are focused to following mains themes: i. FFS methodology; ii. SLM practices to increase soil productivity and food production; iii. Climate smart agriculture; iv. Nutrition; v. "VSLA"; vi. Social cohesion and pacific resolution of conflicts; vii. Costs and benefits analysis
Output 2.3: Network of (pre) cooperatives/producer s organizations and FFS groups supported and demonstrating improved access to food value chains (merged pre 2.3+2.4)	Continuous	No action done yet	No action done yet	i. Training on agribusiness plan development, ii. First priority Value chains identifications and	Training on the structuring of FFS into cooperatives and professionalization in agricultural value chains		70%	14 Cooperatives already organised and ready to start cooperatives activities around 6 value chains

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
				iii. Market analysis inside and outside the project area iv. implementation of new value chain				
Output 2.4 : An in situ seed bank system established and farmer-produced adapted varieties promoted through FFS and knowledge sharing on nutritional and other benefits of diversified local food systems at community and provincial levels	Continuous	No action done yet	Training of 27 trainers on DATAR tool	Data collection on agrobiodiversity in the 9 watershed of the project area	Training on Agrobiodiversity data analysis held		70%	A data analysis is planned for the 3 rd term of this year
Output 2.5: Steep slopes and highly degraded areas rehabilitated through tree planting, with attention to indigenous species, to increase biodiversity, productivity and	Continuous	No action done yet	1. 4324 ha of land cover by tree plantation; 2. 147 Km of river bank protected by bamboo;	1. 8907 ha of land cover by tree plantation; 2. 147 Km of river bank protected by bamboo;	1. 17742 ha of land cover by tree plantation; 2. 207 Km of river bank protected by bamboo;		80%	7 000 000 of agroforestry and forestry trees are planned to be produced this year

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
resilience and to reduce pressure on woody material.			3. 70 Km of contour lines in place	3. 180 Km of contour lines in place	3. 390 Km of contour lines in place			
Output 3.1: Government staff and extension workers trained and able to use relevant M&E tools and approaches, also in archiving and analyzing data	Continuous	A first team of 27 government staff trained on LADA-WOCAT	71 government staff trained on monitoring and evaluation tools such as: 1. EX-ACT : 22; 2. Collect Earth: 22 and 3. DATAR: 27	122 government staff (76 M and 46 W) trained on monitoring and evaluation tools such as: 1. EX-ACT : 22 (18 M and 4 W; 2. Collect Earth: 22 and (18 M and 4 W) 3. DATAR: 78 (40 M and 38 W)	139 government staff (92 M and 47 W) trained on monitoring and evaluation tools such as: 1. EX-ACT : 22 (18 M and 4 W; 2. Collect Earth: 22 and (18 M and 4 W) 3. DATAR: 95 (56 M and 39 W)		90%	Implementation of these M&E tools is proceeding on the field
Output 3.2: Pre-cooperatives and FFS groups trained and able to use participatory impact monitoring tools and approaches (HH-BAT, FFS PM&E, LADA local)	Continuous	No action done yet	Training on Participatory FFS M&E tools for 30 FFS facilitators and 43 FFS groups such LADA-WOCAT and DATAR	First priority value chains identification and new value chains initiated in the project area	17 cooperatives around 6 sustainable value chains		70%	The project expects to train the first groups of cooperatives created with the FFS group which curricula have been completed (by November)

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
as a basis for decision making.								
Output 3.3: Project results and experiences compiled, communicated widely and shared with the project regional hub and partner projects	Continuous	No action done yet	2 reports and a technical communication shared	7 reports and a technical communication shared	10 reports, 4 published articles and a technical communication shared during regional meetings		80%	The present PIR will be the 4 th and includes the 8 th PPR
Output 3.4: Project progress reports prepared on time, mid and final review/ evaluation conducted	Continuous	1 PPR	3 PPR and 1PIR	5 PPR and 2 PIR developed	7 PPR and 3 PIR		100%	The present PIR will be the 4 th and includes the 8 th PPR

4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

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

In terms of institutional capacity building, the project carried out the following activities: (i) 3 GSADR were organized in the 3 provinces where the project was implemented and 151 representatives of government officials, technical and financial partners, territorial administration, NGOs and community representatives participated, (ii) 62 FFS facilitators have continued the accompany of 105 FFS groups who have continued and achieved their training cycle ; (iii) capacity building for government staff in DTAR, Collect Earth and EX-ACT.

In terms of improving community livelihoods, 3373 households grouped into 105 FFS groups have been involved in training on good agricultural practices, sustainable land management, experimental trials on productivity and agricultural production resilient to climate change. Agroecosystem Analysis (AESAs) on various crops, and income-generating activities involving beans, wheat, corn, potatoes, soybeans, bee keeping and mushrooms activities have been carried out. In addition, in order to mitigate climate change effects, small scale irrigation have been developed and insure increase production for food security and nutrition

With regard to environmental preservation, the project, in close collaboration with the environmental, agricultural and livestock bureaus and FFS groups and other implementation partners, produced and planted 4,119, 338 forest and agroforestry plants that allowed the project to reach a covered area of 15 277 ha land under agroforestry.

In partnership with ISABU via a letter of agreement signed with the FAO, fruit seeds have been produced and the principal results are the following:

- 717 Kg of vegetable seeds produced from 9 high-yielding, high nutritional value varieties,
- 100,000 avocado plants (Hass, Fuerte and Simpos varieties), 150,000 Japanese plum plants and 150,000 maracuja plants, 10000 *artocarpus heterophyllus* (Jackfruit) have been produced in 1 nursery at Rukoba area and planted by the beneficiaries of the 3 provinces of the project area,
- 108 farmers trained in market gardening and fruit plant production techniques.

As part of the Monitoring and Evaluation of the project's impacts: (i) Agrobiodiversity Data analysis has been organized for a training trainers team, (ii) a data analysis has been conducted with Collect Earth tool and (iii) Regular progress reports on project activities developed and (iv) Regular monitoring of project interventions on the ground by the PCU and BH on a regular basis.

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

2 major constraints encountered in the implementation of the project: (i) slow administrative procedures and (ii) the restriction of field activities due to covid-19, national strategy for harmonization of FFS process has been temporary stopped. The project as other partners using FFS approach have been recommended to adapt it to the new governmental policy related to environment, agricultural and livestock popularization. Currently, the national strategy needs to be reviewed accordingly.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR.

For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2021 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2021 Implementatio n Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2020 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MS	MS	During 2020-2021, the project had planned significant progress in building stakeholder capacities, developing community livelihoods activities in the field through FFS groups, cooperatives, restoring degraded landscapes and monitoring and evaluating socio-economic and ecological impacts in the field. Unfortunately, due to the covid-19 pandemic, the most important activities on the field such as Provincial GSADR, meetings, trainings and watersheds committees have been stopped.
Budget Holder	MS	MS	If the covid-19 context is mitigated, the project results could be improved. Efforts must be done to increase delivery.
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	MS	MS	Despite the Covid 19 and some administrative challenges, the project is performing quite well. Both development objective ratings and implementation progress rating are MS. Accordingly, the Mid-term evaluation didn't reveal big challenges even considering slowdowns due to the pandemic. It is requested to the project team to explain a bit better how the new governmental policy related to environment can impact the national strategy for harmonization of FFS process as well as the FFS and other agroforestry activities in the project areas.
GEF Operational Focal Point			<i>Optional Ratings/comments</i>

¹⁵ **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. For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁶ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MS	During this FY, the team and national partners have demonstrated their ability to deliver results despite the limitations caused by the COVID 19 pandemic. Overall, the project is progressing moderately satisfactorily towards its development objective and expected outcomes and outputs. Almost all MTR targets have been achieved, although some outputs are still struggling to initiate (i.e functional national GSDAR, efficient value chains and structuring into cooperatives).The MTR recommendations have almost all been accepted by management as actions to be taken into account, it is important that these are well reflected in the upcoming Annual Work Plan to improve project delivery.
--	-----------	-----------	--

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESM plan, when appropriate. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Please add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESM plan, when needed.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

ESM is low so not applicable.

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid¹⁸. If not, what is the new classification and explain.
L	Yes, it is still valid

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>

¹⁸ **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.

6. Risk

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE					
<p><i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. Please make sure that the table also includes the Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</i></p>					
	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Climate contingency risk: Drought	L	No climate contingency concerning drought met during this reporting period	Drought resistant varieties have been tested during the FFS implementation to be adopted if needed	
2	Climate contingency risk: Floods	M	No climate contingency regarding floods met during this reporting period in the project area (just some cases of floods were reported)	Water and soil conservation practices have been developed in order to stop run off	
3	Social risks: Lack of social acceptance of introduced INRM/SLM tools and practices by the target groups will threaten the project's impact and sustainability	ML	Communities are enthusiastic of learning and adopting SLM practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Local communities have been sensitised on the soil degradation and its negative impact on food security and nutrition ii. A participatory watershed actions plan have been developed and catchments committees have been put in place to monitor SLM implementation 	

¹⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

²⁰ 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".

4	Institutional risk: Limited involvement and weak cross-ministerial cooperation between the two involved ministries.	ML	The project has been appropriated by the Ministry in charge of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock and also local administrative authorities.	The participation and cooperation with the Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock has been developed at national, provincial and local level and results are effective.	It is important to identify potential repercussion to the project of the new government policy related to environment
5	Political risk: reduction in political will and decrease in support from the government	ML	The government accepted to allocate counterpart as co-financing (offices, staff, ...)	Government cofinancing is effective	
6	Security issues	ML	The security has been improved in general in the whole country	The security is still guaranteed in the project area and throughout the country, which has allowed the project to work in a safe environment	

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

FY2019 rating	FY2020 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2020 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	M	Although the risk rating is not changed, it should be noted that activities implementation were slowed down by the period-COVID19.

7. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented
<p>Recommendation 1: Multi-stakeholder and multi-scale platforms and knowledge-sharing mechanism: Expand the mandate of the GSADR to include considerations related to the knowledge-sharing mechanism (WOCAT-DATAR Group), the management of good practices (Communal Platform on Good Practices)</p>	<p>The GSADR Communal platforms are planned by the project. It has the same with the LADA – WOCAT Groups. The operationalization of these activities has been disrupted and slowed down by the COVID-19 pandemic.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: Establish a dynamic with the Sub-regional Office to create an expert pool at the national and/or regional level: 1. Form a pool of experts at the regional level for the tools: Exact, DATAR, WOCAT with a view to having national and sub-regional expertise available and at a lower cost in order to overcome the difficulty of not having international experts available.</p>	<p>This recommendation is relevant but goes beyond the competence of the project or the FAO Burundi office, so rejected.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: Transform the Community Watershed Management Plans into a "bankable" document and facilitate ownership of the watershed management plans once the management</p>	<p>The project will add to the watersheds community action plans the objectively verifiable indicators and a realistic budget.</p>
<p>Recommendation 4: Highlight the Resilience Fund approach implemented by the project. Highlight the Resilience Fund approach in the logframe and implementation reports. The Resilience Fund approach implemented by the project, although very effective, is not sufficiently highlighted and promoted by the project because no related indicators are clearly developed in the project's monitoring and evaluation system for the economic and social pillars</p>	<p>The Village Saving Loan Association approach was not foreseen in Prodoc but was introduced to strengthen the resilience of the project's target communities. Indicators will be proposed within the logical framework of the project.</p>
<p>Recommendation 5: Produce initial capitalization documents on knowledge management The evaluation recommends that the project produce simple materials in the local language, "Kirundi"-and also in pictorial form, radio programs, videos, plays, etc., to disseminate messages more effectively. This strengthens</p>	<p>Activities planned in the project's Annual Work Plan and Budget 2021.</p>

SLM/INRM integration and awareness of the many synergistic benefits of SLM technologies.	
Recommendation 6: consolidate the structuring, functioning of existing FFSs, promote pilot value chains, and take into account the concerns of indigenous populations	A report on FPIC of the Batwa indigenous peoples, together with a plan of action, has just been developed. The project is requested to implement it.
Recommendation 7: Identify good practices according to the FAO approach and share knowledge of them with stakeholders	Documentation of good practices of Sustainable Land Management/Integrated Management of Natural Resources is planned by the Project with the WOCAT tool.
Recommendation 8: Organize additional training for the 15 other untrained managers to set up a functional system for collecting data on impact indicators related to household food security, resilience and nutritional aspects	Action planned by the project
Recommendation 9: Continuously document all quantitative and qualitative data related to the project's implementation at the FFS level	Daily actions in the Monitoring and Evaluation of project interventions.
Recommendation 10: Improve the speed of the project's procurement process through greater involvement of the FAO Country Office and clarify misunderstandings about procedures in order to anticipate possible blockages in the project's implementation	FAO is in the process of strengthening the procurement and operations team to ensure speed in the processing of acquisitions.
Recommendation 11: Request an extension of the project for 12 months and re-budget the remaining activities, prioritizing those related to improving the living conditions of the local beneficiary communities. It will also be necessary to take into account the new activities resulting from the recommendations of the MTR	Given the delay in starting the project for a period of 12 months and the restrictions on staff movements due to COVID 19, the one-year Non Cost Extension is justified

Adjustments to the project strategy.

Please note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outputs	No	
Project Indicators/Targets	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	<p>Original NTE: 05 September 2022 Revised NTE: 04 October 2023</p> <p>Justification: See MTR recommendation 11 : Request an extension of the project for 12 months and re-budget the remaining activities, prioritizing those related to improving the living conditions of the local beneficiary communities. It will also be necessary to take into account the new activities resulting from the recommendations of the MTR.</p>

8. 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))

(i) Stakeholders involved

1. Ministry of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (MINEAGRIE) : institutional facilities
2. Project Steering Committee : Approve Annual work plan and budget, monitor implantation activities on the ground
3. Burundian Office for Environment Protection (OBPE) : production of Indigenous trees
4. Provincial Office of Environment, Agriculture and Livestock (BPEAE) of Mwaro, Gitega and Muramvya
5. Geographic Institute of Burundi (IGEBU) : Payment of Environmental Services (PES) on water
6. Agronomic Sciences Institute of Burundi (ISABU) : horticultures and improved avocado
7. Bioversty International: for agrobiodiversity seeds bank management
8. 2 local NGOs (ADISCO and APROCUVI): for activities implementation on the ground regarding watershed management, communities capacities building on SLM and livelihoods
9. ADRSEPAL, a NGO representing Batwa communities as local indigenous people representative has been recruited to conduct FPIC process
10. Burundian Office of standardization : quality control of the value chains products.

(ii) The projet has actively participated on Stakeholders events such as :

- National day of tree plantation in December 2020
- World Food Day in October 2020,
- World environment Day and the UNCCD Day, June 2021
- World Water Day, march 2021

9. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)

Through Farmer Field Schools (FFS), gender sensitive approach has been applied during the reporting period. In fact, 105 FFS groups have been implemented in that period regrouping 3373 persons. Between them, 69 % are women and 31 % are Male. In decision-making bodies in FFS committees, the participation rate of women is estimated at 50%. This approach will also be applicable for watershed committees planned in the second half of this year.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

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

Here by the summary of the project Knowledge Management Activities:

1. The project has trained governmental staff on SLM tools (LADA-WOCAT, EXACT, Collect Earth and DATAR) to contribute to monitor and assess the socio – economic and ecological project impacts on the field. During the reporting period, the project has registered some capitalization activities via the data analysis trainings by using DATAR and Collect Earth tools. As a result of data analysis with the Collect Earth tool, biophysical characterization of land use systems has been established. The result of data analysis with the DATAR tool, planned in July 2021, will serve as a basis for decision-making at seed bank sites.
2. Transforming FFS group into cooperatives is one way of ownership and sustainability of SLM and community livelihoods activities
3. Through Farmers Fields Schools, local community have been trained and implement various approaches and practices on how to improve soil productivity, crop production, cost and benefits analysis, SLM good practices in order to improve their sustainable livelihoods without disturbing the naturel resources.

11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

Indigenous Peoples and other vulnerable groups in the project area have been consulted and their priorities are taking account during implantation activities in order to improve their livelihoods. After concertation, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities has been developed by one Indigenous NGO.

12. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative²¹ approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

The project has introduced an innovative technic of producing tree seedlings with local and biodegradables materials which contribute to protect environment and improve community-livelihoods.

At present, the import of non-biodegradable sachets is prohibited throughout the country. To adapt ,the communities have found an innovative solution to make biodegradable tubes based on banana leaves. It is an income-generating activity for households and contribute to fit against pollution.

13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptative measures taken to continue with the project implementation.

- ✓ Some outcomes/outputs will be delayed
- ✓ Activities proposed by the MTR will also be affected by COVID-19,
- ✓ Many activities related on capacity building have been postponed and the community participatory target has been reduced such as : trainings, exchange visits, provincial and Communal plateforms GSADR, Watershed committees,
- ✓ Movement restriction for national personal and supervision missions stopped due to international travel restriction,
- ✓ May activities on the ground are not undergoing.

²¹ Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

14. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
GEF Agency	IFAD – PRODEFI	In Kind	21,440,000	15 500 000		
GEF Agency	World Bank - PRODEMA	In Kind	6,000,000	3 000 000		
GEF Agency	World Bank – PADZOC	In Kind	14,110,728	2 400 000		
Government	MINAGRIE	In Kind	3,000,000	1 800 000		
GEF Agency	FAO	In Kind	500,000	500 000		
		TOTAL	45 050 728	23,200,000		

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

As physical activities are diversified on the ground, the project benefits a close collaboration with IFAD project like exchanges visit and knowledge on watershed practices, value chains and FFS live livelihoods activities. Even if the World Bank Projects closed, the GEF project benefits from infrastructures put in place. It is with this in mind that co-financing has significantly increased in this year 2021.

²² 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.