



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2021 – Revised Template



Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021

### 1. Basic Project Data

#### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Africa
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Malawi
<b>Project Title:</b>	Pesticide Risk Reduction in Malawi
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/MLW/052/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5109
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Chemicals (Persistent Organic Pollutants – POPS)
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
<b>Project Duration:</b>	3 years
<b>Project coordinates:</b> ( <a href="#">Ctrl+Click here</a> )	Malawi: S 13°30'00" E 34°00'00" Blantyre: S 15°47'06" E 35°00'31" Lilongwe: S 13°58'01" E 33°47'14"

#### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	1 October 2014
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	25 November 2015
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	24 December 2018
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	31 July 2022

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

<sup>2</sup> In case of a project extension.

<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	Still in operation
--	--------------------

**Funding**

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	2,550,000
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	11,879,374
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):</b>	1,927,906
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021<sup>5</sup></b>	9,952,301

**Review and Evaluation**

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee Meeting:</b>	20 November 2020
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>	December 2018
<b>Actual Mid-term review date:</b>	July 2019
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022)<sup>7</sup>:</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>Yes</b>

<sup>3</sup> Actual date at which project implementation ends - only for projects that have ended.

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

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> The MTR should take place about halfpoint between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date

<sup>7</sup> Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date

<sup>8</sup> 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

**Ratings**

<b>Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Overall implementation progress rating:</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Overall risk rating:</b>	Substantial

**Status**

<b>Implementation Status</b> <i>(1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	6 <sup>th</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

**Project Contacts**

<b>Contact</b>	<b>Name, Title, Division/Institution</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Precious Chizonda, National Project Coordinator, FAO Malawi	<a href="mailto:Precious.Chizonda@fao.org">Precious.Chizonda@fao.org</a>
<b>Chief Technical Advisor</b>	Ivy Saunyama, Agricultural Officer, Pest and Pesticide Management Team (NSPCD)	<a href="mailto:Ivy.Saunyama@fao.org">Ivy.Saunyama@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Mathew Abang, Plant Production and Protection Officer, Sub-regional Office for Southern Africa	<a href="mailto:Mathew.Abang@fao.org">Mathew.Abang@fao.org</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Zhijun Chen, FAO Representative in Malawi	<a href="mailto:Zhijun.Chen@fao.org">Zhijun.Chen@fao.org</a>
<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	Kuena Morebotsane, OCBDD, FAO of the UN	<a href="mailto:Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org">Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org</a>

## 2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcome (DO)

*(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)*

Project objective and Outcomes (as indicated at CEO Endorsement)	Description of indicator(s) <sup>9</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>10</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
<b>Objective(s):</b> To reduce economic, environmental and social risks associated with the use of pesticides in agriculture and to promote sustainable intensification of agriculture						
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Risks to human health and the environment are reduced through safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of pesticide-contaminated sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Up to 240 Tonnes of POPs and other obsolete pesticides disposed of by high-temperature incineration.</li> <li>- 150 tonnes of degraded pesticide disposed of locally by the Government</li> <li>- Tons of soil treated/ One contaminated site remediated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 390 tonnes of wastes inventoried in 2012 out of which 230 tonnes repacked and centralized by CropLife International (CLI) in 2012 whilst 52 tonnes of which required repackaging</li> <li>- 150 tonnes of degraded and low hazard dust grain protectant pesticide inventoried</li> </ul>	Disposal of 390 tonnes of wastes including the 150 tonnes of low hazard dust grain protectant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Disposal of 390 metric tonnes of obsolete pesticide wastes completed</li> <li>b) Remediation of 2 prioritized contaminated sites completed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 215.717 metric tonnes of obsolete POPs and other pesticides disposed of in Sweden and 40.24 metric tonnes of chemical ash disposed of at a landfill in Uganda</li> <li>- Nine sites with potential pesticide-contamination revisited to update the risk assessment and Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for remediation.</li> <li>- Preliminary site investigations and collection of soil samples conducted at six of the nine sites with potential pesticide-contamination</li> <li>- Tender for the disposal of the 11 tonnes of the leftover pesticides prepared,</li> </ul>	MS

<sup>9</sup> 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.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> 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).

		<p>destined for local disposal</p> <p>4 sites with approximately 382 tonnes of contaminated soil identified in the inventory</p>			<p>reviewed and submitted to procurement unit for publishing beginning of July 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tender for the disposal of the obsolete grain protectants under preparation following the change from land farming disposal to landfill or high-temperature incineration due to regulatory changes</li> <li>- The stocks re-assessed following pilferage reports and results indicate minimal loss since warehouse management has put in place stringent control measures against the pilferage. The estimated volume remains 300 metric tonnes.</li> <li>- Soil samples from four pesticide-contaminated sites analysed and an environmental management plan prepared.</li> <li>- Tender for disposal of contaminated soils requiring landfilling or co-processing underway.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their re-use reduced through sound management of empty containers</p>	<p>10,000 empty containers triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling</p>	<p>- Of 55,000 containers generated annually, 5% are triple rinsed, none is collected and recycled</p>	<p>- Establishment of a sustainable empty container management system</p>	<p>- 10,000 are triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling and /or disposal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A feasibility study conducted on container management system establishment</li> <li>- A business model developed through a series of stakeholder meetings</li> <li>- A task force established that is leading the establishment</li> </ul>	<p>S</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 75% of known farms store containers on site</li> <li>No data on unknown farms</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legacy containers that cannot be triple rinsed are disposed of under Outcome 1 if possible</li> </ul>	<p>of a Container Management Scheme (CMS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two options for disposal of empty pesticide containers explored: co-processing and recycling</li> <li>- Cooperatives for smallholder farmers identified for awareness-raising</li> <li>- Triple rinsing and pesticide risk management communication materials developed</li> <li>- Procured a shredder for plastic pesticide containers</li> <li>- Trained a local three-member team under CropLife Malawi on the operation of the shredder and launched it by shredding approximately six tonnes of material</li> <li>- The Minister of Forests and Natural Resources officially launched the ECM pilot on 18 June 2021 and pledged continued government support.</li> <li>- Implementing partners now focusing on the implementation of the business model for sustainability of the scheme and revision of the regulations to allow handling, processing and storage of rinsed empty plastic pesticide containers.</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--	--	---	--

<p><b>Outcome 3:</b> Legal and institutional frameworks strengthened for sound life cycle management of pesticides</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revised national legislation and regulations in compliance with international obligations developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ineffective and non-aligned pesticide legislation to international commitments for pesticide risk reduction in Malawi</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drafting the texts of the technical regulations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revision of pesticide Act of Malawi to align to international commitments and to ensure effectiveness in achieving pesticide lifecycle management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revised text for the pesticide regulations presented to the government for adoption</li> <li>- A five-year strategic plan for Pesticides Control Board elaborated</li> <li>- Capacity building for the Pesticides Control Board (PCB) staff facilitated in FAO Pesticide Registration Toolkit,</li> <li>- Three staff trained in pesticide risk management under the University of Cape Town,</li> <li>- Fourteen active ingredients in 18 products identified as highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs) based on the JMPM criteria from the pesticides register and presented to stakeholders</li> <li>- National HHP survey conducted</li> <li>- Conducted a joint workshop on HHP management with Plantwise CABI project</li> <li>- Combined workshop with EAD to strengthen implementation of Rotterdam Convention including the preparation and submission of FRA and the development of a management plan for HHPs in Malawi</li> </ul>	<p>S</p>
--	---	---	---	---	--	----------

<p><b>Outcome 4:</b> Integrated Pest Management (IPM) alternatives to conventional pesticides successfully promoted and the use of chemical pesticides and highly hazardous pesticides reduced through Farmer Field Schools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- % Reduction in pesticide use on vegetables, cotton, and maize among trained farmers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No IPM Policy in place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training farmers in IPM and safe alternatives to chemical pesticides through the farmer field school</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Draft IPM Policy submitted to Government for approval</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 413 government extension staff (114 female) trained in new extension methodology of Farmer Field School (FFS) to further train farmers on safe alternatives to pesticides through national fall armyworm response, Prosper, Kulima and Afikepo programmes.</li> <li>- 1,570 farmers out of which 988 are female and 582 male farmers trained and practising in IPM FFS focusing on maize, cotton and vegetables.</li> <li>- % reduction in pesticide use will be reflected in context of HHPs phased out from vegetables, cotton, maize. Proposal is to use import data as a proxy for use to calculate % reduction.</li> </ul>	<p>S</p>
---	---	--	--	---	--	----------



## Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> Risks to human health and the environment are reduced through safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of pesticide-contaminated sites</p>	<p>a) Following up at CSDA the processing of the tender for the disposal of the leftover obsolete pesticides and associated wastes and the grain protectants in dust formulation</p> <p>b) Expediting the implementation of the management plan for the remediation of the pesticide-contaminated sites already developed</p>	<p>- Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and procurement authority at FAO Malawi</p> <p>- The International Consultant for the remediation of the pesticide-contaminated sites</p>	<p>- August 2021</p> <p>- December 2021</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their reuse are reduced</p>	<p>a) Identification of recyclers – there is a need to finalise the identification of the endpoint for the crushed materials</p> <p>b) Compliance of the recyclers to the appropriate regulations before using the shredded material – CropLife and EAD</p> <p>c) Classification of rinsed empty – the waiver is temporary and a permanent permissive regulatory piece is required following global practice</p> <p>d) Sustainability commitment (levying and institutionalization)</p>	<p>- Project Technical Team (CTA, PCB National Project Coordinator (NPC), CropLife Malawi and the Environmental Affairs Department</p>	<p>- July to December 2021</p>

**3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)**  
*(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)*

Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>13</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>14</sup>					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments Describe any variance <sup>15</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
Output 1.1: A safeguarding and disposal strategy is developed in line with national and international best practice	Q2 Y1	- Established and trained a national task team for the disposal of hazardous wastes	- Updated disposal EMP	-	- Strategy for local disposal of degraded pesticides developed		100%	
Output 1.2: 390 tonnes of obsolete stocks and associated	Q4 Y2	- Tender for obsolete pesticides	- The contractor identified	- 255.957 metric tonnes of POPs, pesticide ash	- Testing the samples for the obsolete grain	- Tender for the disposal of approximately	80%	- The selection of a successful bidder

<sup>12</sup> 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.

<sup>13</sup> As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

<sup>14</sup> 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)

wastes are disposed of in an environmentally sound manner		prepared and floated	and conducted a verification exercise	and other obsolete pesticides disposed of in an environmentally sound manner	protectants in dust formulations	11 tonnes of leftover HHPs and associated wastes - Tendering for the disposal of the approx.. 300 tonnes of obsolete grain protectants		cancelled because there was only one responsive bid but at a very high cost above the planned budget - Retendering in progress - Local disposal for the grain protectants cancelled following the changes in the standard threshold values for land disposal - Tendering in progress for engineered landfill or High-temperature Incineration disposal
Output 1.3: Risks posed by 1 contaminated site are reduced	Q3 Y3	A local team trained in risk assessment of contaminated sites	No milestones for this period	Recruiting contractor to carry out remediation	Revisiting the sites, conducting preliminary site investigations and collecting soil samples for analysis	Identification of a laboratory to analyse soil samples from suspected pesticide-contaminated sites	70 %	- All soil samples analysed and a management plan in place - Preparations underway for its implementation

<sup>15</sup> Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

								including containment, soil excavation and disposal by landfilling or co-processing of contaminated soils
Output: 2.1: Container management pilot implemented in Southern Regions of Malawi	Q4 Y3	- Awareness materials mobilised	International empty and local container management consultants recruited	- Consultation meetings conducted - Feasibility study conducted - Business model developed	- Disposal and recycling options explored - Communication materials prepared and meetings initiated	Implementation of the business plan for the empty container management scheme	80%	- Key stakeholders still discussing the institutional and operational arrangements - Business plan implementation now being pursued after the official launch of the ECM pilot
Output 2.2: Assessment and scaling up of the Blantyre pilot scheme to a permanent operator completed	Q4 Y3	- No milestone for the reporting period	No milestone for the reporting period	- No milestone for the reporting period	- Continued discussions with key stakeholders: the industry, government regulators such as EAD to find an endpoint for the collected empty containers	- Assessing the Blantyre pilot scheme for scaling up - Strategy for the management of the container management scheme by pesticide industry approved by the government - Handing over assets	50%	- Pilot scheme assessment and handing will take place next year after the pilot phase launched during the reporting period

## 2021 Project Implementation Report

Output 3.1: National regulations developed and updated in conformity to international guidelines and submitted to Government for approval	Q4 Y3	- Recruited a local and an international consultant	Reviewed regulations and drafted texts as revision for the regulations	- Presented to stakeholders the drafted texts as revision for the regulations	- Further revision of the regulations conducted involving the Legal Affairs Bureau staff pending final submission to government for endorsement	Developed training materials for the inspection and control of pesticides	100%	-
Output 3.2: Measures to strengthen the capacity of the Pesticide Control Board to enforce post-registration Regulations developed	Q4 Y3	-		- Trained pesticides regulators on HHPs identification, risk assessment	- A five-year strategy for PCB elaborated	Training staff on post-registration regulation of pesticides and PSMS	95%	- PSMS training has not taken place and will not take place due to the non-availability of the online PSMS platform. Instead, Toolkit training has been rolled out twice to strengthen pesticide registration in Malawi in addition to an HHP training
Output 3.3: National capacity for pesticide inspections and post-registration enforcement strengthened	Q4 Y3	- No milestone	Trained 10 staff on post-registration regulation of pesticides and FAO toolkit	- No milestone	- Measures for strengthening capacity on post-registration enforcement included in the strategic plan	Developing, validating and rolling out information exchange system	80%	- The PCB is rolling out a complete a management information system as part of the implementation of its five-year

## 2021 Project Implementation Report

								strategic plan 2019 – 2024 elaborated through the project, which covers the information exchange that the PCB will use.
Output 4.1: IPM FFS implementation strategy validated with key stakeholders	Q1 Y1	- Project work plan validated with stakeholders	No milestone for the period	- No milestone for the period	- Already achieved		100%	-
Output 4.2: Capacity building on IPM FFS on cotton, and vegetables, and maize in 3 Agriculture Development Divisions (ADDs) namely Salima, Shire Valley and Machinga	Q4 Y3	- Conducted an assessment of the major problems on targeted crops leading to heavy use of pesticides including HHPs.	Trained 14 facilitators on FFS to build farmers' capacity on adaptive management	- An integrated FFS training curriculum on IPM, CSA and decent work being developed	- The IPM FFS approach being integrated into the national FFS curriculum	Trained 37 farmers (18 female) in cotton and 229 farmers (141 female) in maize IPM	80%	- The development of an IPM strategy and field ecological manuals for selected crops (maize and vegetables) are the remaining activities.
Output 4.3. Communication and dissemination strategy to raise awareness on pesticide risks along the pesticide life cycle and to promote IPM		-		-	-	- Prepared and disseminated appropriate messages on pesticide risk reduction and IPM that are target specific and use appropriate means	50%	- Some materials have been developed and disseminated. - CropLife, Ministry of Forestry and Natural Resources and the Ministry of Agriculture have agreed to

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussions underway to develop an IPM policy/strategy and field ecological guides for IPM FFS on cotton, maize and selected vegetables through a consultative process</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>push for more sensitisation among smallholder farmers</li> <li>- Dialogue is ongoing with stakeholders on the development of IPM policy/strategy taking advantage of revision of the agriculture policy in which the IPM could be embedded</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

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

Under component 1, the project facilitated the analysis of soil samples collected from four sites suspected to have pesticide contamination for general pesticide analysis. Soil samples from one site where there was a fire incident at a pesticide warehouse were analysed for dioxins and furans. The results for general pesticide analysis indicate some contamination at the four sites but no dioxins and furans were detected. The analyses have enabled the preparation of the management plan for each site and the project is preparing the implementation of the management plans. Regarding the disposal of the obsolete pesticides, the project has resubmitted tendering documents for the leftover 11 tonnes and associated wastes of obsolete pesticides that require high-temperature incineration following the cancellation of the previous tendering process. The cancellation occurred because only one bid was responsive at a cost four times higher than the budget. The new tender has provisional for use of regional disposal facilities and it is anticipated that the costs will be within budget. Local disposal of the obsolete grain protectants cancelled due to new open disposal threshold values set by US EPA that do not permit open land disposal anymore. A tender for disposal by co-processing in a cement kiln or engineered landfill is under preparation.

Under component 2, the project obtained a waiver from the Environmental Affairs Department (EAD) to pilot the empty container management scheme, procured, tested and launched an empty plastic container shredder and trained a local team to operate the shredder. The waiver was necessary since current regulations do not allow for the processing and recycling of empty pesticide containers, which the law classifies as hazardous waste. The project continued discussions with key stakeholders on the implementation of the business plan and institutionalisation of the scheme for the sustainability of its operations after the launch of the pilot ECM. For the second half of the year, CropLife, PCB and EAD will be exploring concrete avenues to make the regulatory environment more conducive to facilitate a fully-fledge implementation of the business case supported by the project.

In line with component 3, the project continued to support staff training in pesticide risk management, supported the implementation of HHP management and the implementation of the five-year strategic plan. On implementation of the HHP management plan, the PCB is disseminating messages on banned and restricted products through print and electronic media, intensifying monitoring and inspection, preparation of final regulatory action notifications to the Rotterdam Convention Secretariat and holding HHP management workshops with key stakeholders.



In regard of the component 4, the project engaged key stakeholders on the way forward to develop an integrated pest management strategy and field ecological manuals for selected crops. Some key stakeholders engaged include CABI Plantwise project, the Department of Crops Development and the Department of Agriculture Research in the Ministry of Agriculture. The key output is the agreement to engage the process through a single coordinating institution under a letter of agreement for channelling the funds.

The project facilitated a project steering committee meeting (PSC) in Nov 2020. The project team with support from FAO management and partners is implementing the recommendations from the resolutions from the PSC meeting.

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

- The Covid-19 pandemic has significantly reduced the implementation pace of the project activities especially IPM activities under Component 4 and remediation activities under Component 1. Implementation of field activities was halted for the past 12 months, which has prompted the request for a second no-cost extension for another 12 months. Locally, the spread of the virus has significantly reduced giving hope that the implementation pace could accelerate. The project secretariat revised the work plan and circulated it together with recommendations for a 12-month no-cost extension that the PSC endorsed via email. The project has since been granted a no-cost extension until 31 July 2022.
- The failed tender for the 11 tonnes of high risk obsolete pesticides and introduction of more stringent thresholds for local disposal of pesticides by land farming have necessitated re-tendering for the former and revision of environmental management plans and disposal strategies for the obsolete storage insecticides (300t).
- Engagement among the key stakeholders and government counterparts has remained a challenge. The project management unit spends more time generating consensus on key decisions that require partner cooperation. This results in delayed implementation.

### 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 Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	<b>FY2021 Development Objective rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>FY2021 Implementation Progress rating<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>18</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	The overall implementation has improved especially with tangible outputs under component 2 unlike before.
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Moderate Satisfactory</b>	<p>In regard of the component 1, the project has made good progress but procurement activities require fast-tracking to ensure that disposal of the remaining pesticides and grain protectants is completed during the first quarter of 2022.</p> <p>Likewise, the project has achieved very good results in relation of the component 2, finally setting up a model in which public and private sectors are moving in line to attain the goal to come up with a sustainable ECM model in the country. The second semester of 2021 will be critical to foster the sustainable and advocate for a conducive regulatory environment for this effort. In regard of the components 3 and 4, they have somehow not moved with the speed desired due to the constraints imposed by COVID-19, particularly for some mobility limitations as well as difficulties to prioritize message dissemination among the current situation</p> <p>There is need to invest more efforts around ownership of project activities by the Pesticide Control Board , however, there has been progress during the last reporting period. In a nutshell, the progress of the project is moderately satisfactory and in order to safeguard the gains obtained, a no-cost extension has been requested.</p>

<sup>16</sup> **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.

<sup>17</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>18</sup> Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

<b>GEF Operational Focal Point</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	The Project has registered significant progress despite disruptions posed by the Covid 19 pandemic. Understandably most activities hinged on procurement of tenders and with the situation surrounding the pandemic, this posed a lot of challenges. However, we expect that activities will be fast tracked to avoid further delays in meeting expected timelines.
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	Significant progress has been made with the project implementation, especially Components 1 (Disposal and remediation) and Component 2 (Container Management) under the review period. It is anticipated that the regional disposal facilities will provide a cost-effective solution for environmentally sound disposal of the remaining obsolete stocks (11t high risk obsolete pesticides and 300t low risk storage dust insecticides). The project needs to focus on commencement of remediation of contaminated soils now that results from analyses of soil samples are available. The IPM strategy/policy is a major output and focus has to be given to this activity for the remainder of the project implementation period.
<b>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	Implementation of this project, like many other activities, has been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Even so, the project team has managed to address some key bottlenecks that were slowing down implementation - the waiver for the container management scheme. In the next final 12 months, in addition to completion of all remaining activities, it is important that the knowledge generated by the project is widely shared with partners and other projects.

---

<sup>19</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

## 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
<b>ESS 1: Natural Resource Management</b>				
Land, air and water pollution due to handling, transportation and disposal of the obsolete pesticides	Developing an environmental management plan	Cancellation of the local disposal of the obsolete grain protectants due to changes in the US EPA threshold values for open land disposal of the active ingredients in the obsolete grain pesticide	Following the management plan and mitigation measures for the disposal of the remaining highly hazardous pesticides and grain protectants	CTA, NPC, International Consultant, EAD
<b>ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats</b>				
Poisoning and destruction of both terrestrial and aquatic habitats due to disposal of obsolete pesticides locally and abroad	Developing an environmental management plan	Cancellation of the local disposal of the obsolete grain protectants	Disposing of the obsolete pesticides using a safer alternative process	International Consultant, NPC and CTA
<b>ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
Not applicable				
<b>ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
Not applicable				
<b>ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management</b>				
Pesticide resistance	Limiting the use of obsolete pesticides to avoid resistance build-up	Maintaining and monitoring the safeguarded obsolete	Safe disposal of the safeguarded obsolete pesticides	CTA, NPA, CropLife, Ministry of Agriculture

		pesticides to control pilferage		
<b>ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement</b>				
Not applicable				
<b>ESS 7: Decent Work</b>				
Child labour engagement	Following the recommended local and international labour engagement standards	No child labour practice engaged	Maintaining -non-engagement in child labour	NPC, Ministry of Agriculture
<b>ESS 8: Gender Equality</b>				
Gender bias in labour engagement between male and females	Promotion of equal participation of both men and women in the project activities	Ensured that both women and men have equal participation and voice in the project activities	Maintaining equal participation and voice for both women and men in the project activities	NPC, CTA, Ministry of Agriculture
<b>ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage</b>				
Not applicable				
<b>New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY</b>				
COVID-19	Following all preventive measures against the spread and contraction of the virus	- Following updates on the spread of the virus and all preventive measures Getting a vaccine against the virus	Continue following the preventive measures	All project implementers and partners

**In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at the CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.**

<b>Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)</b>	<b>Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid<sup>20</sup>. If not, what is the new classification and explain.</b>
High	The existence of the COVID-19 virus poses a significant risk as its spread can increase again due to mutant variants. This can lead to halting the implementation again as before as a preventive measure.

<sup>20</sup> **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.

**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.**

No grievance received

## 6. Risks

### Risk ratings

#### RISK TABLE

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 the manifestation of the risk in your specific project, **as relevant**.

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>22</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	The emergence of new local or global epidemic/pandemic infections and other human-health related matters. Currently, there is COVID-19.	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Postponement of missions (international travel and restricting local travel to critical missions only)</li> <li>- Requesting another 12-month second no-cost extension to the project period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delays factored in the second no-cost extension submitted for consideration</li> <li>- Teleworking once all work-related travel is suspended due to Covid-19</li> <li>- Constantly following health and sanitation advisory</li> </ul>	

<sup>21</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High

<sup>22</sup> 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 <sup>21</sup>	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>22</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Insufficient funds dedicated to the remediation of the prioritized site and the disposal of POPs	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Budget revision and negotiating for co-financing with partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The budget estimates for the disposal works have been revised based on the previous rates</li> <li>- Budget revision has made some additional provisions towards remediation activities</li> </ul>	
3	Institutional arrangements pose challenges to project execution	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regular review of the partnership arrangements to call for timely support in cases of slack in participation</li> <li>- Reminding partners of their roles during PSC meetings and bilaterally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PMU continued engagement of responsible partners in the implementation of respective project components</li> </ul>	
4	Increased pilferage of centralized stocks before repackaging and transportation for final disposal	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conducting routine monitoring for rapid response</li> <li>- Sensitising the custodians of the stocks about the dangers of obsolete pesticides through a pesticide risk management approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project technical team expediting the preparation of the tender for the disposal of stockpiled obsolete pesticides.</li> </ul>	
5	Likelihood of political instability	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining neutrality during implementation</li> <li>- Following security advisories the department of safety and security</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constantly adhering to mitigation measures</li> </ul>	
6	Extreme weather conditions such as torrential rain and floods	Low to medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consulting with weather experts and utilising regular weather update information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project team utilises information from regular weather updates</li> </ul>	
7	Environmental contamination from leakage of POPs and other obsolete pesticides due to poor conditions of containers	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Repackaging the leaking obsolete stocks into new containers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constant monitoring of the stocks for timely action being followed</li> </ul>	

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>22</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
8	Continued government centralised procurement of pesticides through parastatal companies will give rise to re-accumulation of obsolete stocks	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revision of pesticide regulations including pesticide procurement processes and improving coordination among procurers</li> <li>- Demand-side management of pesticides by training farmers in the use of safer alternatives such as the integrated pest management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The PCB has submitted the revised pesticide regulations to the Ministry of Justice and Constitutional Affairs for adoption approval</li> <li>- Training farmers in IPM through FFS continuing</li> <li>- Periodic monitoring of pesticide usage at commercial farmers level and offer offering advisory services on the proper disposal</li> </ul>	
9	Lack of appropriate storage for safeguarded stocks	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improving the monitoring of the stocks at the storage facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring at the storage facilities is periodically conducted</li> </ul>	
10	Local treatment of obsolete grain protectants in dust formulation not successful or are incomplete leading to leakage and run-off	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conducting chemical analysis of the stocks to check the presence of environmentally damaging contaminants risky to human health before disposal of locally</li> <li>- Preparing an ESMP for the disposal works</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local disposal cancelled following the US EPA revision of threshold values for outdoor exposure and environmental contamination of the active ingredients in the obsolete grain protectants</li> <li>- The stocks will now be disposed of by high-temperature incineration abroad</li> </ul>	
11	Accidents/injuries during safeguarding and disposal of obsolete pesticides	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Training workers and the rest of the team members in occupational health and safety procedures</li> <li>- Provision of PPE</li> <li>- Developing and following SOPs during operations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ESMP developed</li> <li>- SOP and OSH procedures development in progress</li> </ul>	



	Risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>22</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
12	Delays in the procurement of goods and services	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Conducting thorough preparations of requests such as providing adequate and accurate information as well as timely submission of requests for approval</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project team conducts periodic meetings to strategise submission of pending requests for procurement of goods and services</li> <li>- Project team meetings with procurement unit staff</li> <li>- Preparation of procurement plans in time</li> </ul>	
13	Government authorities disagree with the strategy for the reduction of risks posed by contaminated sites	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing strategies based on evidence-based data and best technologies available and following global standards</li> <li>- Timely engaging regulators on strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project team has suggested technically sound strategies based on the best technologies with assistance from qualified local and international consultants</li> <li>- The PMU continues to engage relevant partners timely</li> </ul>	
14	Delays in administrative procedures/decisions as regards transport of obsolete stocks	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proactively seeking guidance from responsible regulatory authorities and timely submission of requests for clearances</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The PMU has kept the custodian of the obsolete stocks updated on progress for disposal and maintained coordination with the regulatory bodies</li> </ul>	
15	Technical staff being exposed to pesticides during collection and repacking of empty containers	Low to medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing appropriate PPE to technical staff for use during collection and repackaging of pesticide wastes including empty containers</li> <li>- Training technical staff in OSH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff are always provided with PPE whenever working with or close to obsolete pesticide wastes</li> </ul>	

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>22</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
16	Lack of stakeholder involvement in proper disposal of empty containers and the establishment of a sustainable system for the management of wastes.	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning for routine engagement of stakeholders</li> <li>- Sharing of updates to show progress on the establishment of the sustainable empty container management scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consolidated working with representatives of partners in mobilising support from the implementing partners</li> </ul>	
17	Delayed adoption of updated legislation. Lawmaking (including the promulgation of regulations) is a prerogative of the State and will depend on the will of the legislature or law-making authority to enact legislation	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Submission of quality documents to minimise iterative corrections and enhance chances of adoption</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continued discussion between the PCB and the Legal Bureau after the submission for final adoption</li> </ul>	
18	Loss of IPM FFS facilitators after investment in ToT	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collaborating with other FAO projects to train all agriculture extension staff in FFS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The technical team at PMU participates in all FFS facilitator training targeting extension workers</li> <li>- More government extension staff now trained than envisaged</li> </ul>	
19	Climate Change – Changes in the climate will affect pest distribution, activity, seasonal appearance, as well as the impact on the behaviour of chemicals in the environment.	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continuous monitoring of pests through a network at the farmer level and utilising advisory information from pesticide monitoring centres to take appropriate actions</li> <li>- Participating in the national efforts towards climate change and pest management coordination teams</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project team is part of the national training of farmers and extension workers in the control of the Fall Armyworm, <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i>.</li> <li>- Collaboration with Plantwise project that monitors plant pests and diseases</li> </ul>	

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

FY2020 rating	FY2021 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Substantial	Substantial	Covid-19 Pandemic risk has persisted

## 7. Adjustments to Project Strategy – Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)

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

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented
<p><b>Recommendation 1: Timely procurement of goods and services</b> – FAO should hasten the procurement of goods and services as required. This includes the identification of laboratories required for sample analysis. Recruitment and negotiation processes should also be significantly accelerated and optimised at FAO</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Measures to address delays in procurement:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>Timely submission of a procurement plan</i></li> <li>b) <i>Regular meetings involving the project team, procurement unit staff and the senior management for requisite follow up</i></li> <li>c) <i>Closer liaison with Procurement team at FAO Malawi and as necessary, CSDA at HQ</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>- <i>As far as possible recruitment from existing consultant rosters (e.g. use of AGPMC rosters)</i></li> <li>- <i>Previous outstanding procurement of goods and services have been dealt with i.e. soil sample analysis, procurement of a shredder and tendering of the disposal of obsolete pesticides</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendation 2: Management of pesticide containers</b> – FAO should engage partners both locally and internationally for establishing empty container management at a higher level to discuss the current challenges and to map an agreeable way forward</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The project undertook a progressive engagement with the key stakeholders on ECM such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>Fortnight Skype meetings with the core team in FAO responsible for the ECM (NPC, international and national ECM consultants and as may be necessary, CTA/LTO)</i></li> <li>b) <i>FAO (PMU and international consultant) convened regular meetings with Croplife International discussing ways of finding a local solution for the empty pesticides containers</i></li> <li>c) <i>Regular meetings of the ECM task force meetings</i></li> <li>d) <i>PCB to facilitate requisite clearance for regulatory clearances and approvals for the pilot to take off</i></li> <li>e) <i>PCB to ensure re-assertion of the role of Croplife Malawi as lead partner for the ECM activities</i></li> <li>f) <i>PCB and EAD to discussed regulatory support required for the facilitation of the establishment of the ECM</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><i>Results:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The EAD issued a waiver for the piloting the ECM against the classification of rinsed empty containers as hazardous</i></li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>ECM shredder tested and piloted under CropLife pending the launch of the ECM scheme</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendation 3:</b> The private industry with comparative advantage (including the plastic industry, potential recyclers of plastic material, and commercial farm owners, such as the tobacco and sugar industry) shall be engaged as stakeholders to ensure progress, especially on stewardship and funding for sustaining activities beyond the project (such as the establishment of a formal empty container management scheme that is accessible and usable to all farmers, including the enforcement of triple rinsing and the institutionalisation of a tax levy). Private industry involvement further includes the transfer of responsibility of empty containers to the importers/suppliers of pesticides (see also recommendation 2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The recommendation was partially accepted as FAO can only go as far as coordinating the implementation of the project. However, for the full responsibility of this recommendation, CropLife Malawi is the lead on the ECM activities</i></li> <li>- <i>Current status – CropLife has undertaken the following steps</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <i>Sensitized the pesticide industry on the pilot scheme including triple rinsing of empty containers and the intention to pilot and roll out the scheme</i></li> <li>b) <i>Engaged the regulatory authorities (the PCB and the EAD) on how to progress with levying for funding the ECM scheme</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendation 4:</b> The proposed changes for IPM FFS implementation should have been initiated timely and through a proper protocol of involving the key stakeholders, such as the LTU and the partners through the PSC. If possible, the IPM FFS should continue with the identified zones of intervention as planned</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The project IPM activities and pesti risk reduction are mainstreamed into the on-going FFS identified in the original agro-ecological zones through agriculture extension workers and farmers. This way, most of the original districts have been covered albeit in a different modality.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendation 5:</b> Stakeholder engagement should be enhanced to all levels (specifically governmental departments). FAO shall act more pro-actively among the partners by positively engaging them, utilising the suggested ways from the PMU. Updated action plans shall be developed (indicating mitigation measures for missing co-financing and stakeholder involvement, as well as the identification of similar interventions to seek synergies and complementarity with other projects)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>There is a positive progression in the engagement of all key stakeholders and close follow up on all project activities with clear roles and responsibilities, especially for PMU, PCB, CropLife and the Steering Committee.</i></li> <li>- <i>Since the MTR, the involvement and active participation of all key stakeholders has significantly improved</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendation: 6</b> The project shall link to ongoing projects and interventions, and engage relevant partners, such as the MBS, academia, and NGOs working in the field (and other than SHA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The project has functional linkages with Kulima and Afikepo FAO led programs and other key stakeholders such as the EAD, CropLife including academia (Mzuzu University) but Self Help Africa constructively delinked itself from the project activities.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendation: 7</b> Communication (internal and external) and information exchange needs significant improvement. This shall include short, but regular meetings and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Internal and external information exchange on relevant project matters has significantly improved. This has been further strengthened by the virtual meetings that</i></li> </ul>

weekly calls. Any issues and problems shall be addressed transparently and timely	<i>increased in frequency as a preventive measure against contracting COVID-19 virus.</i>
<b>Recommendation: 8</b> The project shall consider a no-cost project extension to achieve meaningful results	<p>- <i>The project requested a no-cost extension up to July 2021 and it was granted. However, there have been significant delays in implementation again due to the advent of Covid-19 such that the project requested another 12-month extension from June 2021 to July 2022. Therefore, the project team:</i></p> <p><i>a) Discussed with the Ministry of Agriculture through the PCB on the no-cost extension and subsequently, the PCB requested the PSC for an endorsement that was granted</i></p> <p><i>b) Revised the work plan, budget and prepared a request for an extension were submitted to the FAO GEF Coordination Unit for consideration</i></p> <p><i>c) The second no-cost project extension has been approved</i></p>

### 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, mid-term review, final evaluation 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
<p><b>Project extension</b></p>	<p>Original NTE: 24 Dec 2018                      Revised NTE: 31 July 2022</p> <p>Justification: delays with delayed implementation due to Covid-19 pandemic and difficulties to secure disposal of remaining obsolete pesticides.</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))**

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

The project has five major stakeholders namely the Ministry of Agriculture within which there is the PCB, Department of Agriculture Extension Services (DAES), Department of Agricultural Research Services (DARS) and the Department of Crops Development (DCD), the Environmental Affairs Department (EAD), Malawi Bureau of Standards (MBS) and CropLife Malawi/International. These are the stakeholders included in the project design and they are the co-financiers of the project both in kind and in monetary terms. SelfHelp Africa as an NGO stopped taking part in implementing and co-financing the project activities as originally planned. This happened before the MTR.

The project continued engaging the partners directly on specific issues and through the project Steering Committee. The project shared implementation updates and sought consensus on dealing with implementation challenges and a second no-cost project extension. An outline on some specific stakeholder engagement is as below:

### *Ministry of Agriculture*

- Engagement with the PCB on the implementation of Component 3 activities, obsolete pesticides disposal, the establishment of an empty container management scheme
- Engagement with the EAD on the disposal of obsolete pesticides and the establishment of a sustainable empty container management scheme
- Engagement with the DCD on the drafting of a national integrated pest management strategy
- Engagement with DAES on the training of extension workers in pesticide risk management and farmer field school implementation

### *CropLife Malawi/International*

- The stakeholder is the implementing partner for components 1 and 2 and leads the task force put in place to implement activities for establishing an empty container management scheme. CropLife facilitated the training of a local team in the operation of a plastic container shredder, repair and maintenance of the shredder, raising awareness among the pesticide industry members on empty container pilot scheme and is actively involved in the activities towards the disposal of the obsolete grain protectants
- The outcome of engaging CropLife has been the establishment of a functional team that operates a plastic container shredder, successful testing of the shredder and putting in place a mechanism for the launch of the pilot empty container management scheme



## 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)

The project did not make a gender analysis. However, the project recognizes the role that women play in the agriculture sector where they supply most of the labour along with the agriculture value chain in the agriculture sector. The project also recognizes the need for decent employment and the need to eliminate child labour in the agriculture sector. As such the project promotes the participation of women where possible e.g. in pesticide risk management training and does not engage any child labour.

Furthermore, the project M&E system has put in place means of reporting in a gender-disaggregated manner depending on the nature of the intervention and tracking gender impacts and results. The project coordinator is a trained gender officer. The project is expected to contribute towards generating socio-economic benefits or services for women through reduced human health and environmental risks arising from pesticide use.

## 10. Knowledge Management Activities

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

First, the project activities are under the guidance of the FAO Malawi communication team. Secondly, the project with the support from the communication team developed a communication strategy. The focus of the communication strategy is to share knowledge and skills on pesticide risk management and promote project visibility among key stakeholders and the public.

However, there have been fewer communication activities that took place during the reporting period. The intensification in implementing the communication strategy halted during the first quarter of 2020 due to COVID-19. Since then implementation has been slow due to meetings and travel restrictions as part of preventive measures against the contraction of the virus. Nevertheless, few activities took place in collaboration with the PCB and other FAO projects through print and electronic media such as radio messaging on the triple rinsing of empty pesticide containers, banned and restricted pesticides and roadshows on the dangers of applying pesticides to harvested tomatoes during marketing time.

## 11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

This section does not apply to this project in Malawi. The country does not have a specific group designated as indigenous that are involved in the project.

## 12. Innovative Approaches

**Please provide a brief description of an innovative<sup>23</sup> 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 through CropLife repaired a defective retention screed for the feeder unit of the plastic container shredder. The project undertook this initiative by engaging the trained local personnel who operate the shredder. These are individuals from CropLife members who have experience in similar work at their respective companies. The initiative saved time and financial resources by avoiding the hiring of a private company or referring the defective screen back to the foreign manufacturer.

The initiative stands out because normally it takes months to get services when a request is generated and acted upon through the FAO procurement unit. By cutting time and costs significantly, the initiative accelerated the full testing of the shredder and subsequent planning for the launch of the pilot empty container management scheme by making the shredder reader on time.

## 13. The 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 adaptive measures taken to continue with the project implementation.**

The COVID-19 pandemic has significantly affected the implementation of the project activities. From March 2020 until May 2021, all field activities involving travel and physical meeting were halted as a preventive measure against contracting the virus. Only virtual meetings were permitted. Key activities suffered serious delays thereby necessitating another no-cost extension of the project till June 2022. Likewise, the terminal evaluation has been postponed to the first quarter of 2022.

Both the project personnel and the beneficiaries have been affected by the pandemic during the reporting period. Project personnel changed working habits from working at the office to working from home, which has some challenges such as limited resources compared to working from the office. Project beneficiaries/stakeholders could not access services due to the cancellation of physical meetings.

The project personnel drew lessons on preparedness for and prevention of a pandemic disease. The advent of the new virus brought in unusual sanitary conditions such as wearing of face masks, frequent handwashing with detergent and observing social distance unlike before. These are lessons on how to prevent highly infectious disease.

---

<sup>23</sup> Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

### 14. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>24</sup>	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
International Association of Agrochemical Companies	CropLife International	Grant	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
		In-Kind	50,000	200,000	50,000	50,000
NGO	Self Help Africa (SHA)	In-Kind	1,158,359	0	0	1,158,359
National Government	Pesticides Control Board (PCB)	In-Kind	1,113,854	1,500,000		1,113,854
National Government (Statutory Organisation)	Malawi Bureau of Standards (MBS)	In-Kind	350,000	350,500	0	350,000
National Government	Environmental Affairs Department (EAD)	In-Kind	360,000	360,000	0	360,000
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture	Grant	380,000	380,000	0	380,000
		In-Kind	2,243,000	1,682,250	0	2,243,000
UN Agency	FAO	Grant	4,574,161	4,000,000	0	4,574,161
		In- Kind	400,000	229,551	0	400,000
Total in USD			11,879,374	9,952,301	1,300,000	11,879,374

*Notes: FAO increased its co-financing through the integration of project component 4 activities through Kulima and Afikepo programs in which FAO is the lead implementing agency. Similarly, the government institutions (EAD and PCB) have matched the level of co-financing anticipated at project planning level. However, SelfHelp Africa changed focus accompanied by staff turn-over and has since fallen off without co-financing.*

<sup>24</sup> 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.

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

The contribution by CroPLife has increased in kind through the support towards the establishment of an empty container management scheme. Likewise, the contribution from the PCB continues to increase as it hosts the project management unit. On the contrary, contributions from the Malawi Bureau of Standards has remained low due to low participation in project activities compared to the other partners whilst SelfHelp Africa pulled out the stakeholder consortium and did not co-finance as expected.

## **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.