2015

Project Implementation Review (PIR)

of

PIMS 4863

Strengthening The Resilience Of Post Conflict Recovery And Development To Climate Change Risks In Sri Lanka

Table of Contents

Α.	Basic Project and Finance Data	<u>2</u>
В.	Project Contacts and Links	2
	Project Summary	_
	Progress toward Development Objective	
	Progress in Implementation	
	Adjustments	
	Critical Risk Management	
	Environmental and Social Grievances	
I.	Communicating Impact	. <u>10</u>
J.	Partnerships	. <u>10</u>
К.	Progress toward Gender Equality	. <u>11</u>
L.	Annex 1 - Ratings Definitions	. <u>12</u>

Page 1 of 12

A. Basic Project and Financ	e Data
Project Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Disaster Management
GEF Focal Area:	Climate Change - SCCF
Country(ies)	(SRL) Sri Lanka
Project Start Date:	25-Jun-2014
Planned Project Closing Date:	30-Jun-2017
Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period:	June 2015 December 2014 August 2014
Total GEF Grant (U\$S)	\$ 3,121,818
GEF Grant Disbursed as of 30 June (U\$S):	\$ 0.00
Total Co-financing (as planned in CEO endorsement request):	\$ 57,095,000
Overall Risk Rating	High
Overall DO Rating	
Overall IP Rating	

B. Project Contacts and Links

Partner	Contact Name	Email Address
Project Coordinator / Manager	Sampath Abeyrathne	sampath.abeyrathne@undp.org
UNDP Country Office Programme Officer	Dhanus <u>h</u> ki Abhayarathne	dhanushki.abhayaratne@undp.org
	W.M. Bandusena, Ministry of Disaster Management	
GEF Operational Focal Point	Ajit Silva	koralage2001@yahoo.com
Other Partners		
UNDP Technical Adviser	Srilata Kammila	srilata.kammila@undp.org
UNDP Programme Associate		

Project website, etc.	
Links to media coverage	

C. Project Summary

Commented [CO1]: We need a project summary

D. Progress toward Development Objective

Objective/	Description	Description of	Baseline Level	Target Level at end	Level at 30 June 2015		Commented [CO2]: Please don't add very detailed
Outcome		Indicator		of project			responses here. Focus your response to whether or not (or, to what extent) were the targets of each indicator in
Objective	Increase the resilience	No of sectoral	< 05	> 20 strategies and	It is too early to report the		the left met. Detailed info on what happened in the past
1	of communities to	adaptation strategies	alimata rick	their associated actions	progress against the objective		year should go below, under implementation progress.
	climate change	identified by the project	climate risk assessment is non-	implemented	especially because the IP		I have deleted some extra details in the responses,
	induced hazards	approved and budgeted			Ministry was dissolved 4		below.
	through integration of	by the Departments of	existent	Climate risk assessment	months after the project		
	climate smart policies	Agriculture, Agrarian		included in planning	started. The project was then		
	and actions in to	Development, Coastal		processes for VDPs,	re-assigned in June 2015, 5		
	development planning	Conservation and		district development	months later.		
	and budgeting.	Ministry of Economic		plans and Gama			
		Development		Neguma/Divi Neguma	because the project was inhas		
				national Programmes	<u>been in operation for less than</u>		
		Climate risk assessment		in 12 vulnerable	5 months. <u>Nevertheless.</u>		Commented [CO3]: This is not accurate. Technically,
		is an integral part of		districts	<u>d</u> =uring this period the project		the project started operations in 25 June 2014, which
		development planning			was able to identify a set of key	$\langle \cdot \rangle$	would mean, it has been active and operational for one
		at national and district			adaptation actions with		year.
		level			relevant government		Commented [DA4]: True. But only on paper.
					department <u>s</u> . <u>The achievement</u>		
					of the development objectives was significantly affected by		
					recent changes in the political		
					situation of the country.For		
					example, minor irrigation		
					cascade development with		
1					climate and disaster resistant		
1					designs was identified as one		
					of the key adaptation		
					strategies with the Department		
					of Agrarian Development. At		
					the same time, nature farming		
					home gardening, micro		
					irrigation development,		
					commercial agriculture such as		
					cultivation of Pineapple and		
					Banana with buy back		
					agreements with exporters		
					were identified as key		
					adaptation actions with the		
					Provincial Department of		
					Agriculture. These will increase		
					the resilience of the		
					community in Kurunegala		
					district and thus they will be		
					implemented in year 2015.		
Outcome 1	National rural	No of Gama Neguma	0	> 150 Gama Neguma	Divinaguma programme was		Commented [CO5]: From the "target" in the left
	development	and Divi Neguma		Projects	influenced to implement		column, it seems that we need to modify or influence
	programmes Divi	projects modified			adaptive livelihood measures	\sum	150 projects. Is this programme one of these 150
	Neguma and Gama	through climate risk		> Divi Neguma	and incorporate climate and		projects?
	Neguma integrate	assessments at GN and		Strategies including	disaster resistivity resilience		Commented [DA6]: No. it's the 2 nd target
	climate risk	Divisional Level		-crop selection for	into the existing programs. For		
	information and			home gardens	example, diversified livelihood		
	adaptation measures			nome garacito	development programs were		Commented [CO7]: How many?
			August 14, 2015Jul	1			

	in 12 vulnerable districts		0	-livestock choice -water and soil management incentives -inland/freshwater fishery	promoted in order to minimize dependency on water. This included the implementation of a larger scale poultry farming program in climate and disaster sensitive manner. However the achieving of the development objectives were significantly affected by the changed political situation of the country.
Outcome 2	risk considerations in designing, approving and implementing development projects under the Gama Neguma and Divi Neguma programmes	Number of staff (disaggregated by gender) within national, district, divisional and local planning units in 12 vulnerable districts reported to apply climate risk assessment tools and methods to new rural investment projects No of stakeholder groups reporting enhanced awareness of climate change risks and adaptation measures at national, district and village levels	0 (lack of awareness has been reported as a major barrier during stakeholder consultations)	National officers of NPD, MoED, MoF = 20 Technical agencies and department= 50 District Planning and Samurdhi officers= 75 Village Mobilisers= 300 Local Authority Technical Officers =120 Trainers trained =15 Key stakeholder groups listed below report higher level of awareness measured by before and after survey-Officers of National Planning, Ministry of Economic Development -Divi Neguma Task Force at National and District level -District Planning Units -Divisional Planning Units -Village mobilisers- communities in risk prone GN units	During that time the awareness of 20 government officers who directly took part in the project implementation was enhanced on climate change adaptation in development planning.
Outcome 3	actions defined and implemented in selected vulnerable villages/ village clusters in the 12 target districts to	% increase in annual income of farmers (disaggregated by gender) as a result of project introduced adaptation measures implemented in home gardens and small farms Total value of community driven rural infrastructure built following building codes and construction controls and guidelines	annual income = or < USD1500 in target farm households 0	baseline value of Gama	The progress against this objective is also low for reasons given above. HoweverTo date, the project was able to set the ground for implementing concrete climate change adaptation actions by identifying key economic sectors (including minor irrigation and agriculture development) and adaptation priorities. Kurunegala district located in Daduru oya river basin is considered as the district with highest density of minor

September 23, 2015August 20, 2015August 14, 2015July 25, 2015

Page 4 of 12

Commented [DA8]: Yes, that's why its mentioned against the achievement of the main objective. This is repeated here.

Commented [CO9]: Wouldn't this affect the implementation of all outcomes and not just Outcome 2?

Commented [CO10]: Since we need to report on "stakeholder groups" of ministries and agencies such as Planning, Finance, etc (according to the target in the left column), it would be good to mention the ministries under which these 20 officers work.

for climate and disaster	irrigation tanks in the country
risk reduction	Climatic change impacts are
	highly associated with water
	deficit and agriculture sector i
	Kurunegala district. Therefore
	minor irrigation and agricultu
	development were identified
	as two key economic sectors
	implement adaptation action
	The project <u>team</u> was able to
	set the ground for
	implementing collaborate
	actionsfor collaborative work
	between-with the Departme
	of Agrarian Development and
	Provincial Department of
	Agriculture. The project
	initiated implementation of
	concrete climate change
	adaptation actions in
	Kurunegala district during th
	year 2014. This included min
	irrigation cascade system
	development, micro irrigatio
	development and agriculture
	development. However, som
	planned activities could not b
	completed given the
	dissolution of the Ministry of
	Economic Development, the
	identified IPthe project was
	unable to complete planned
	minor irrigation and micro
	irrigation development
	activities once the Ministry w
	dissolved.

Progress toward Objective Development	Rating	Comments
Project Manager/Coordinator	Satisfactory	The Project Manager was able to streamline the project activities towards achieving the development objectives by identifying the key economic sectors, priority adaptation actions and developing linkages with key government agencies. <u>However, the Although Project Manager was able to set the ground for implementing adaptation actions to achieve the development objective, the activities could not be continued due to the external factors that are beyond the control of Project Managerdissolution of the IP. This significantly affected_delayed the project progress. However, now the project has reinitiated activities</u>

Commented [CO11]: NOTE: we are NOT rating the PM here; here is where the PM rates the project, in terms of CUMULATIVE progress towards reaching the end targets.

<u>September 23, 2015August 20, 2015August 14, 2015</u>July 25, 2015

Page 5 of 12

Commented [CO12]: I think we need to be more specific here regarding the following: -when did the IP dissolve? -Is the IP operational again? Since when? -What is the PMU going to do, or already did in order to ensure that activities are back on track in spite of delays?

	The new IP, the Ministry of Disaster Management, agreed to the option of UNDP providing additional support functions to the project. This 'Assisted NIM modality' was implemented in order to support the limited staff capacity of this new Ministry and to minimize the risk <u>of reduced delivery in 2015 due to the that the</u> project delivery is affected by upcoming parliamentary election <u>in</u> August 2015.
UNDP Country Office Programme Officer	The project is rated as Moderately Satisfactory, due to the fact that it_is still expected to achieve most of its major objectives and globally relevant impacts, despite the project's poor performance during this reporting period. This is the first year of operation of the project, the project start was delayed for multiple reasons, and eventually the project document was signed in July 2014. The project activities started by September, and implemented rapidly till December 2014. January 8, 2015 Sri Lanka held its Presidential Elections, and the new Government chose to dissolve the (IP) Ministry of Economic Development (MED) which housed the DiviNeguma Department. The project was not allocated to another Ministry till June 2015, and ultimately UNDP managed to meet with senior Ministers in the Government and push for the project to be allocated. It was then allocated to the Ministry of Disaster Management (MDM). MDM has started implementing the project immediately. Nevertheless these issues have caused significant delays to the project, which could not be avoided. However currently, the project is operational, and proceeding rapidly. UNDP expects significant progress in the last 2 quarters of 2015 and progress towards achieving the outputs especially of outcome 3 where most of the work is focusing this year.
Project Implementing Partner	
GEF Operational Focal point	
Other Partners	
UNDP Technical Advisor	

E. Progress in Implementation

Outcome 1: National rural development programmes Divi Neguma and Gama Neguma integrate climate risk information and adaptation measures in 12 vulnerable districts

The progress of this output is fairly low since the IP was dissolved 4 months after the project was started.

During this reporting period the project was able to integrate couple a fewof adaptation measures into the Divi Neguam program. For example Minor irrigation cascade development with climate and disaster resistant designs was identified as one of the key adaptation strategies with the Department of Agrarian Development. At the same time, nature farming home gardening, micro irrigation development, commercial agriculture such as cultivation of Pineapple and Banana with buy back agreements with exporters were identified as key adaptation actions with the Provincial Department of Agriculture. These will increase the resilience of the community in Kurunegala district and thus they will be implemented in year 2015.7.4

The project influenced the Divinaguma programme to implement adaptive poultry farming by introduc<u>inge especially</u> designed movable poultry cages with sufficient ventilation to withstand extreme weather situation. <u>This p</u>Poultry farming program was

<u>September 23, 2015August 20, 2015August 14, 2015July 25, 2015</u>

Page 6 of 12

Commented [CO13]: Please indicate each output under each Outcome, with its number ("output 1.1; 1.2; etc). In this section, report ONLY on the progress between 1 July and 30 June. implemented throughout the Kurunegala district in 18 Divisional Secretariat Divisions. 11,030 poultry chicks with 1,103 movable poultry cadges were provided to 1,103 beneficiary families in Kurunegala district. The objective of this program is-was to reduce livelihood dependency on water, diversify the livelihoods to reduce risk and increase the resistivity of the intervention to extreme weather phenomenon. This will also improve the food and nutrient security of the beneficiary families.

The project <u>also</u> set the ground for developing village development plans and divisional level climate exposure and sensitivity maps in selected districts.

Outcome 2: National, district, divisional and local technical staff have sufficient technical capacity to identify and integrate climate risk considerations in designing, approving and implementing development projects under the Gama Neguma and Divi Neguma programmes

Training and capacity building of the project immediate stakeholders

The project conducted a training workshop for 20 Divisional Officers, Agriculture Instructors, Livestock Development Instructors, and Farmer Organizations in the selected project locations on climate change adaptation in irrigation rehabilitation and agriculture development. Following objectives were achieved through this training programme; (a) project immediate stakeholders have a better understanding of climate change adaptation and how it applies on selected project locations, (b) technical knowledge of the immediate stakeholders in the selected locations were enhanced on nature farming home gardening and irrigation rehabilitation.

Outcome 3: Concrete adaptation actions defined and implemented in selected vulnerable villages/ village clusters in the 12 target districts to increase resilience of rural development programmes to climatic risks

Kurunegala district located in Daduru oya river basin is considered as the district with highest density of minor irrigation tanks in the country. Climatic change impacts are highly associated with water deficit and agriculture sector in Kurunegala district. Therefore minor irrigation and agriculture development were identified as two key economic sectors to implement adaptation actions. The project selected 32 minor irrigation tanks in Kurunegala district for rehabilitation. The project was able to complete the surveying and planning of 5 tanks while that of other 27 tanks are on going. The contracts were issued for the rehabilitation of 3 tanks. However the rehabilitation was delayed since January. However, now the project work has re-started and rehabilitation of 32 tanks will be completed during period of next 3 months.

The project also implemented agriculture development and animal husbandry preogramme in year 2014. The project promoted the cultivation of perennial fruit crops in order to increase the land and water use efficiency of the beneficiary villages. The initial phase of the project has selected 5 villages in 3 Divisional Secretariat Divisions for perennial fruit crops cultivation actions. The perennial fruit cultivation actions are implemented through farmer organization The project supported the farmers to plant 20,000 fruit seedlings (pomegranate-4,000, guava-5,000, banana-3,000, orange â[®] 6,000 and lemon 2,000). Farmer trainings were also conducted on agricultural technologies, and marketing linkages were facilitated with buy back guarantee.

Poultry keeping programme was implemented throughout the Kurunegala district in 18 Divisional Secretariat Divisions. 11,030 poultry chicks with 1,103 movable poultry cadges were provided to 1,103 beneficiary families.

Progress toward Implementation	Rating	Comments
Project Manager/Coordinator	Satisfactory	Although Project Manager manages day to day project operations well, the progress of the project is very much behind the target because the project implementation was significantly affected by the external factors that are totally beyond the control of Project Manager. For example the project operation was completely stopped for 6 months until the new government assigns the project to a relevant ministry (the government was changed after the presidential elected held on January and with that the line ministries were significantly changed. The new government

September 23, 2015August 20, 2015August 14, 2015July 25, 2015

Page 7 of 12

Very recently the project was assigned to the Ministry of Disaster Management and now the project, is back on track. UNDP Country Office Programme Officer Moderately Satisfactory This is the first year of operation of the project, the project start was delayed for multiple reasons, and eventually the project document was signed on 25 July 2014. The first Steering Committee (SC) of the project was held on the 18th September 2014. The SC approved an annual work plan (AWP) and budget his 2014 plan but the National Coordinator was confident and the Secretary supported the decision, and endorsed recruiting this 2014 plan but the National Coordinator was confident and the Secretary supported the decision, and endorsed recruiting this 2014 plan but the National Coordinator was confident and the Secretary supported the decision, and endorsed recruiting this report. National Project Coordinator of MoED together with UDDP, developed work plans to expedite the anticipated work for this year, to achieve maximum results over the three month period. Accordingly a number of activities were conducted as described in this report. Imwary 8, 2015 Sri Lanka held its Precidential Elections, and the new Government chose to discove the (III) Milkitry of Elocanie Development (MED) which housed the Dividegum Department. The department was coled down significantly and billed to another, Following the dissolution of the MED_TFFF project was not allocated to an only bif rule MD2. The project was not allocated to another Ministry UII June 2015, despite UNDP's consistent efforts due to the Ministry of Disaster Management (MDM). While this decision is positive and the programme. Clina sprentry with the UNDP Comprehensive Disaster Management (MDM). While this decision is positive and the programme can synergize with the UNDP Comprehensive Disaster Management. The MDA is a much smaller ministry, that the project transgread cycleady and the specially related to project programme. This partnership with the department is yert to be fully establis			priorities the constitutional issues and the development project were affected badly.
Programme Officer was delayed for multiple reasons, and evenually the project document was signed on 25 July 2014. The first Steering Committee (SC) of the project was held on the 18th September 2014. The SC approved an annual work plan (AWP) for the remaining three months of 2014. UNDP was skeptical of achieving this 2014 plan but the National Coordinator was confident and the Scretary supported the decision, and endorsed recruiting 4 full time and 8 Part time cadre to the project in addition to the Technical Coordinator recruited from UNDP. Ground level work started only in Kurunegala and Puttalam districts this year. The National Project Coordinator of McD together with UNDP, developed work plans to expedite the anticipated work for this year, to achieve maximum results over the three month period. Accordingly anumber of activities were conducted as described in this report. Immune Schlick Schlick Buschlick Bu			
9th June 2015, and work is rapidly progressing on the 3rd outcome area on the ground level. UNDP believes, that if no	,	Moderately Satisfactory	Management and now the project is back on track. This is the first year of operation of the project, the project start was delayed for multiple reasons, and eventually the project document was signed on 25 July 2014. The first Steering Committee (SC) of the project was held on the 18th September 2014. The SC approved an annual work plan (AWP) and budget of 790,000 USS, of the original 1,037,822 USS 2014 AWP, for the remaining three months of 2014. UNDP was skeptical of achieving this 2014 plan but the National Coordinator was confident and the Secretary supported the decision, and endorsed recruiting 4 full time and 8 Part time cadre to the project in addition to the Technical Coordinator recruited from UNDP. Ground level work started only in Kurunegala and Puttalam districts this year. The National Project Coordinator of MoED together with UNDP, developed work plans to expedite the anticipated work for this year, to achieve maximum results over the three month period. Accordingly a number of activities were conducted as described in this report. January 8, 2015 Sri Lanka held its Presidential Elections, and the new Government chose to dissolve the DiviNeguma Department. The department was scaled down significantly, and shifted to nother Ministry. Following the dissolution of the MED, If the project was not allocated to another Ministry till June 2015, despite UNDP's consistent efforts due to the government focus on the 100 day programme. Utimately UNDP managed to meet with senior Ministers in the Government and push for the project to be allocated. It was then allocated to the Ministry of Disaster Management (MDD). While this decision is positive and the programme can synergize with the UNDP Comprehensive Disaster Management Programme in the same ministry, there remains certain aspects that will still have to be linked with the DiviNeguma programme. This partnership with the department is yet to be fully established. A number of contextual factors have significantly affected th
parliamentary election, the project should be able to achieve			9th June 2015, and work is rapidly progressing on the 3rd outcome area on the ground level. UNDP believes, that if no further major organisational changes come up from the next

September 23, 2015August 20, 2015August 14, 2015July 25, 2015

Page 8 of 12

Commented [CO14]: Don't repeat from the explanations in the DO rating. Simply explain the rationale behind rating the past year as "satisfactory"

Project Implementing Partner	
GEF Operational Focal point	
Other Partners	
UNDP Technical Advisor	

F. Adjustments

Project Planning				
Key project milestone	Status	Original Planned Date (Month/Year)	Actual or Expected Date (Month/Year)	Comments
Inception Workshop	on schedule	June - 2014	June - 2014	
Mid-term Review	n/a	-	-	
Terminal Evaluation	n/a	-	-	

G. Critical Risk Managemer

I

Critical Risks Type(s)	Critical Risk Management Measures Undertaken in 2015	
Political	The presidential election and subsequent change of the government affected the project progress. The line ministries were changed under the new government, and the Implementing Partner the Ministry of Economic Development was dissolved. This was a risk factor that was beyond the control of project. The project was reassigned only 6 months later. Parliament elections scheduled for mid August is also expected to affect the project and therefore to mitigate this risk, UNDP has discussed with the new IP and will provide assisted NIM support for a period of 1 year from June 2015.	
Organizational	The ProDoc specified that the IP Ministry of Economic Development would provide a certain number of staff to work on the project. The new IP Ministry of Disaster Management is a much smaller ministry with less staff, and is unable to provide the identified staff to support the project. Full time cadre cannot also be allocated as per government rules. This is expected to affect the project implementation. <u>T</u> this is another reason that the Ministry and UNDP agreed for UNDP to provide assisted support to NIM for a period of an year.	
Political	Over the last 6 months in the Ministry of Disaster Management, the Secretary has changed thrice. After the August parliamentary elections, more changes to senior staff in the ministry is expected. Very frequent changes of the key senior staff of the key ministries will affect the progress. This issue will continue until the political situation of the country become stabilized. The project will implement under an assisted NIM modality to manage this risk.	
Operational	The project is now adopting a rapid mode of deliver <u>y to make up for the 6</u> months of non delivery in 2015, and complete infrastructure construction before the rainy season. However the probability of quality of work being compromised is quite high- Thus-Therefore the project is paying special	

September 23, 2015August 20, 2015August 14, 2015July 25, 2015

Page 9 of 12

Commented [PJ15]: Please give "Original Planned date" and "Actual/Expected Date" for both MTR and TE in the online PIR.

Commented [CO16]: These risks must correspond to there risks that appear in the ATLAS log. We also need to determine the total number of critical risks in order to calculate the overall risk rating of the project.

Commented [DA17]: From your comment, its not clear what needs to be done here. Can you be more specific pls.

	attention for to quality assurance in order to minimize the operational risks associated with quality control, monitoring and evaluation.
Operational	As per the prodoc, the project is supposed to incorporate climate change
	adaptation into the village development plans that are to be produced by the Department of Divinaguma Development. However, Department of
	Divinaguma Development has been down-graded by the new government and thus it is more likely that the village level development plans will not be produced by them. This is a risk for the project. Nevertheless the project
	plans to develop climate and disaster sensitive village level development plans during the year 2015-2016.

Overall Risk Rating: HIGH

l

H. Environmental and Social Grievances		
Related environmental or social		
issue		
Status		
Significance		
Detailed description	During the project period, no greivancesgrievances have been received or recorded.	

I. Communicating Impact

Tell us the story of the project focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's lives.
It is too early to report on this as most of the newly initiated actions are not yet matured to make changes of the lives of the people.
What is the most significant change that has resulted from the project this reporting period?
The newly initiated project actions are not yet matured enough to make significant changes of the people lives so far.
Describe how the project supported South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation efforts in the reporting year.
N/A

J. Partnerships		
Partners	Innovation and Work with Partners	
Civil Society Organisations/NGOs	N/A	
Indigenous Peoples	N/A	
Private Sector	N/A	
GEF Small Grants Programme	N/A	

<u>September 23, 2015August 20, 2015August 14, 2015July 25, 2015</u>

Commented [CO18]: What exactly IS the operational risk here?

Commented [CO19]: What is the difference between this operational risk and the operational risk above?

Commented [DA20]: Your questions not clear. What is not clear about this comment?

Other Partners	The project is partnering with UNV programme to develop village development plans and divisional level climate exposure and sensitivity
	maps. This partnership adds value for the project as the Department of
	Divinaguma Development no more have the mandate to develop village level development plans.

K. Progress to	ward Gender Equality
Has a gender or	Will be carried out in <u>2016<mark>the future</mark></u>
social assessment	
been carried out this	
reporting period?	
If a gender or social	
assessment has been	
carried out what	
where the findings?	
Does this project	Yes
specifically target	
woman or girls as	
direct beneficiaries?	
Please specify results	The poultry keeping program implemented by the project will increase the income for women which is mainly
achieved this	spent on family consumption and children's education.
reporting period that	
focus on increasing	
gender equality and	
improving the	
empowerment of	
women.	

I

Page 11 of 12

Annex 1 - Ratings Definitions

Development Objective Progress 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 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 presented as 'good practice'.

Satisfactory (S): Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): Implementation of 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.