



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	10
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	13
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	16
6. RISKS	19
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	27
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	29
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	30
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	32
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	33
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	35
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	36

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country:	Malawi
Project Title:	Pesticide Risk Reduction in Malawi
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/MLW/052/GFF
GEF ID:	5109
GEF Focal Area(s):	Chemicals (Persistent Organic Pollutants – POPS)
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
Project Duration (years):	6 years
Project coordinates:	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"

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	1 October 2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD:	25 November 2015
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 March 2023
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2 550 000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	11 879 374
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	2,369,207
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	10,537,146

¹ As per FPMIS

² If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

³ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

⁴ For DEX projects, the GEF Coordination Unit will confirm the final amount with the Finance Division in HQ. For OPIM projects, the disbursement amount should be provided by Execution Partners.

⁵ Please refer to the section 12 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	March 2022
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	July 2019
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	September 2022
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	NA

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Category B (Moderate) ⁸
---	------------------------------------

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	7 th PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Precious Chizonda, National Project Coordinator, FAO Malawi	Precious.Chizonda@fao.org
Budget Holder	Zhijun Chen, FAO Representative in Malawi	Zhijun.Chen@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Mathew Abang, Plant Production and Protection Officer, Sub-regional Office for Southern Africa	Mathew.Abang@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Kuena Morebotsane, OCBDD, FAO of the UN	Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org

⁶ The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2nd PIR, around half-point between EOD and NTE. The MTR report in English should be submitted to the GEF Secretariat within 4 years of the CEO Endorsement date.

⁷ The Terminal Evaluation date should be discussed with OED 6 months before the project's NTE date.

⁸ The Moderate correspond to the previous category B <https://www.fao.org/3/i4413e/i4413e.pdf> according to the former EIA Guidelines <https://www.fao.org/3/i2802e/i2802e.pdf>

2. Progress towards Achieving Project Objective(s) (Development Objective)

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

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁹	Baseline	Mid-term Target ¹⁰	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹¹ since project start, the level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹²
To reduce economic, environmental and social risks associated with the use of pesticides in agriculture and to promote sustainable intensification of agriculture	Outcome 1: 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"> - Up to 240 Tonnes of POPs and other obsolete pesticides are disposed of by high-temperature incineration. - 150 tonnes of degraded pesticide disposed of locally by the Government - Tons of soil treated/ One 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 390 tonnes of wastes inventoried in 2012 out of which 230 tonnes were repacked and centralized by CropLife International (CLI) in 2012 whilst 52 tonnes of which 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disposal of 390 tonnes of waste including the 150 tonnes of low hazard dust grain protectant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Disposal of 390 metric tonnes of obsolete pesticide wastes completed b) Remediation of two prioritized contaminated sites completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 - Nine sites with potential pesticide contamination were revisited to update the risk assessment and Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) for remediation. - Preliminary site investigations and collection of soil samples conducted at six of the nine sites with potential pesticide-contamination 	S

⁹ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

¹² Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

		contaminated site remediated	required repackaging 150 tonnes of degraded and low hazard dust grain protectant pesticide inventoried			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Soil samples collected from the pesticide-contaminated sites analysed and an environmental management plan prepared - The obsolete stocks of dust grain protectants re-assessed following pilferage reports and pilferage confirmed especially at Chirimba (Blantyre) and Kanengo (Lilongwe) warehouses. - A contractor for the disposal of the 11 tonnes of the leftover pesticides combined with the remediation of three pesticides-contaminated sites identified in the first quarter of 2022 - Part of the tender for the disposal of the obsolete grain protectants cancelled due to high costs than the available budget (NB. <i>PIR July-Dec 2021 stated that a decision had been taken not to proceed with landfarming of the obsolete storage dust insecticides as originally intended during project design due to the reviews in international thresholds for contaminant levels permissible for landfarming</i>) 	
	Outcome 2: Health and environmental risks associated	- 10,000 empty containers triple rinsed, collected and stored	- Of 55,000 containers generated annually, 5% are triple	- Establishment of a sustainable empty container	- 10,000 are triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting	- A feasibility study conducted on container management system establishment	5

	<p>with empty pesticide containers and their re-use reduced through sound management of empty containers</p>	<p>awaiting recycling</p>	<p>rinsed, none is collected and recycled</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 75% of known farms store containers on site - No data on unknown farms 	<p>management system</p>	<p>recycling and /or disposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legacy containers that cannot be triple rinsed are disposed of under Outcome 1 if possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A business model developed through a series of stakeholder meetings - A task force was established for the establishment of a Container Management Scheme (CMS) - Two options for disposal of empty pesticide containers were explored: co-processing and recycling - Cooperatives for smallholder farmers identified for awareness-raising - Triple rinsing and pesticide risk management communication materials developed and disseminated - Procured a shredder for plastic pesticide containers - 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 	
--	--	---------------------------	---	--------------------------	--	---	--

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Minister of Forests and Natural Resources officially launched the ECM pilot on 18 June 2021 and pledged continued government support. - Commercial farmers now utilising the shredder - CropLife now implementing the business model for sustainability of the scheme and pushing for the revision of the regulations to allow the handling, processing and storage of rinsed empty plastic pesticide containers. - CropLife leading partner in the exploration of co-processing of the shredded material at a Zambian cement plant and certification of the scheme. 	
	<p>Outcome 3: Legal and institutional frameworks strengthened for sound life cycle management of pesticides</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised national legislation and regulations in compliance with international obligations developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ineffective and non-aligned pesticide legislation to international commitments for pesticide risk reduction in Malawi 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Drafting the texts of the technical regulations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revision of the pesticide Act of Malawi to align with international commitments and to ensure effectiveness in achieving pesticide lifecycle management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Revised text for the pesticide regulations and presented to the government for adoption - A five-year strategic plan for Pesticides Control Board elaborated - Capacity building for the Pesticides Control Board (PCB) staff facilitated in FAO Pesticide Registration Toolkit, - Three staff trained in pesticide risk management under the UCT Post Graduate Programme, - Fourteen active ingredients in 18 products were identified as highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs) based on the JMPM criteria from the pesticides 	5

						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> register and presented to stakeholders - A National HHP survey conducted - Conducted a joint workshop on HHP management with the CABI Plantwise project to elaborate an HHP mitigation plan - Combined workshop with EAD to strengthen implementation of Rotterdam Convention including the preparation and submission of Final Regulatory Action (FRA) and the development of a management plan for HHPs in Malawi - The transition of the PCB into a statutory corporation was completed as a recommendation of its five-year strategic plan developed earlier under the project 	
<p>Outcome 4: Integrated Pest Management (IPM) alternatives to conventional pesticides are successfully promoted and the use of chemical pesticides and highly hazardous</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % reduction in the use of pesticides on vegetables, cotton, and maize among trained farmers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No IPM Policy in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training farmers in IPM and safe alternatives to chemical pesticides through the farmer field school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft IPM Policy submitted to Government for approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Over 700 government extension staff with a third of female extension workers trained in the new extension methodology of Farmer Field School (FFS) to further train farmers on safer alternatives to pesticides through national fall armyworm response, Prosper, Kulima and Afikepo programmes/projects. - 1,570 farmers out of which 988 are female and 582 male farmers trained and practising in IPM FFS focusing on maize, 	s	

	pesticides reduced through Farmer Field Schools					<p>cotton and vegetables (cabbages and tomatoes).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International (CABI) engaged through an LOA in the development of an IPM strategy and other communication materials focusing on cabbages, tomatoes, cotton and maize. First stakeholder consultation workshop conducted and set of IEC materials drafted. 	
--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--

Action Plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Workplan)

Outcomes and Outputs ¹³	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹⁴ (please avoid repeating results reported in the previous year's PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁵ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.1: Risks to human health and the environment reduced through safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of pesticide-contaminated sites	-	-	-	-
Output 1.1.1: A safeguarding and disposal strategy is developed in line with national and international best practice	- Number of safeguarding and disposal strategies developed in line with national and international best practices	- 1 strategy	- 1	- N/A
Output 1.1.2: 390 tonnes of obsolete stocks and associated wastes are disposed of in an environmentally sound manner	- Number of tonnes of POPs and other obsolete pesticides disposed of by high-temperature incineration	- 11 tonnes of POPs - 300 tonnes other	- 0 - 0	- Identified contractor for the disposal of POPs expected on site in July 2022 - Tender partially awarded excluding other pesticides due to budget limitations
Output 1.1.3: Risks posed by 1 contaminated site are reduced	- Number of sites remediated	- 3 sites	- 0	- Identified contractor mobilizing for remediation works in accordance with schedule of work in the contract

¹³ Outputs as described in the project Log-frame or in any approved project revision.

¹⁴ Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

Outcome 2.1: Health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their reuse are reduced	-	-	-	-
Output 2.1.1: Container management pilot implemented in Southern Regions of Malawi	- No. of CMS institutions established	- 0	- 0	- Already achieved
Output 2.1.2: Assessment and scaling up of the Blantyre pilot scheme to a permanent operator completed	- No. of pilot schemes assessed and handed over to a permanent operator	- 1	- 0	- In progress -Lead partner CropLife working on institutionalization and levies
Outcome 3.1: Legal and Institutional frameworks strengthened for sound life cycle management	-	-	-	-
Output 3.1.1: National regulations developed and updated in conformity to international guidelines and submitted to the government	- No. of revised national legislation in compliance with international obligations developed	- N/A	- N/A	- Finalized
Output 3.1.2: Measures to strengthen the capacity of the Pesticide Control Board to enforce post-registration Regulations developed	- No. of measures to strengthen the capacity of the Pesticide Control Board to enforce post-registration regulations developed	- N/A	- N/A	- Finalized
Output 3.1.3: National capacity for pesticide inspections and post-registration enforcement strengthened	- No. of staff trained in various capacity building interventions for inspection and post-registration enforcement	- N/A	- N/A	- Finalized
Outcome 4.1: IPM alternatives to conventional pesticides successfully promoted and the use of chemical pesticides and highly hazardous pesticides reduced through Farmer Field Schools	- % Reduction in pesticide use on vegetables, cotton, and maize among trained farmers	-	-	-
Output 4.1.1: IPM FFS implementation strategy validated with key stakeholders	- No. of FFS Implementation strategy validated with key stakeholders	- N/A	- N/A	- Finalized

Output 4.1.2: Capacity building on IPM FFS on cotton, vegetables, and maize in 3 Agriculture Development Divisions (ADDs) namely Salima, Shire Valley and Machinga	- No. of capacity building activities on IPM FFS for cotton, vegetables and maize	- N/A	- N/A	- Only monitoring
Output 4.1.3: Communication and dissemination strategy to raise awareness of pesticide risks along the pesticide life cycle and to promote IPM	- Number of extension providers, farmers and other pesticide users receiving information (materials and/or events)	- N/A	- N/A	- On-going through other projects

4. Summary of Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges and outcome of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR.

Progress summary

The key remaining activities for the project are under components 1 and 2. Under component 1, two activities of disposing of 11 tonnes of obsolete pesticides leftover from the previous disposal exercise and the disposal of the 150 tonnes plus additional tonnage of obsolete grain protectants remain. Currently, the selection and awarding of a contract for the disposal of the 11 tonnes of highly hazardous pesticides and associated wastes was completed. The contractor is mobilizing resources to commence work. However, this was a partial award that has excluded the obsolete dust grain protectants due to the budgetary constraints. The bidders quoted for high temperature incineration and the costs were very high and way above the available budget, hence the stocks will not be disposed under the project. Meanwhile, a cement company in Zambia has offered to carry out the disposal of the dust grain protectants through co-processing. The implementing partners are yet to discuss the associated costs and next steps for the disposal of the dust grain protectants. The second activity is the remediation of pesticide-contaminated sites. Originally, the project planned to remediate only two sites from five potential sites where soil samples were collected. Soil analysis from the sites eliminated some sites remaining with three, which the project plans to work on. The works were combined with the disposal of the obsolete pesticides hence the same contractor will carry out the remediation works at the three sites. It is expected that both the disposal and the remediation works will be completed by the third quarter to allow monitoring of the remediated sites till the first quarter of 2023.

Under component 2, work is continuing with the rolling out of the pilot empty container management scheme. CropLife as a lead partner in collaboration with the Environmental Affairs Department and the PCB are working on the institutionalization of the pilot scheme and the implementation of a levy to sustain the operations of the scheme. Commercial farms started utilizing the scheme while raising awareness among smallholder farmers and the establishment of collection points among smallholder farmers are key activities to continue. There is also a possibility of working in collaboration with a CropLife member who is championing similar work in central and northern regions to consolidate the operations and serve as a focal point for the southern region.

Activities for component 3 were finalized. The PCB has now completed the evolution from a government department under the Ministry of Agriculture into a statutory corporation following the strategy elaborated under the project and the revised pesticides Regulations were rolled out. PCB staff underwent various training programmes to improve the skills and knowledge necessary for pesticide lifecycle management practices including the FAO Pesticide Registration Toolkit and University of Capetwon (UCT) Post Graduate Diploma in Pesticide Risk Management.

Similar to component 3, component 4 activities were largely concluded. FFS activities including training extension workers and raising awareness among farmers and promoting of safer alternatives were integrated into other programmes and projects. Through the integration, the project continued to train extension workers at extension worker training centres across the country. However, the Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience (CABI) is developing an integrated pest management strategy and field ecological manuals for maize, cabbages, tomato and cotton. The project facilitated a consultation workshop and work is expected to finish during the third quarter of 2022.

The project facilitated a project steering committee meeting in March 2022. The members discussed and agreed on the request for a third no-cost project extension owing to the challenges that still existed in the identification of a contractor to carry out the disposal of obsolete pesticides and the remediation of the pesticide-contaminated sites as well as the development of an integrated pest management strategy which are key activities determining the success of the project. The no-cost extension has since been granted and the two activities have progressed as reported above.

Challenges

There were no serious challenges during the reporting period apart from running through several procurement processes to identify a contractor for the disposal of the obsolete pesticides and remediation of the pesticide-contaminated sites.. The identification of the disposal contractor underwent three bidding processes two of which were unsuccessful and the third resulted in a partial award due to the high cost of the disposal of the grain protectants. As a result, the obsolete storage dust insecticides will not be disposed and a way forward beyond the project lifespan has to be discussed with key stakeholders.

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

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons¹⁸ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>With the progress in identifying a contractor for the disposal of the remaining 11 tonnes of obsolete pesticides and associated wastes as well as for the remediation of the pesticide-contaminated sites, the project is likely to achieve the key and overall objectives hence contributing toward the global environmental benefits. Furthermore, there has been a sustained momentum on the empty container management scheme under the lead partner, CropLife which marks significant progress in all major areas of focus under the project.</i>
Budget Holder	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>The project has made concrete progress in having the disposal contract finalized and in the development of the IPM strategy which will greatly improve the projects impact as the project is coming to an end.</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁹	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>The Project has achieved commendable progress in the FY2022. The putstanding activities need to be fast tracked to ensure timely implementation.</i>
Lead Technical Officer²⁰	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>Significant progress has been made to complete work that was outstanding at the end of the previous reporting period (Components 1 and 4). Both the disposal contract for obsolete pesticides (ii1) and remediation of contaminated soils, as well as the LoA for development of an IPM strategy.</i>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>The project is on track to achieve most of the results targets that were set in its design. Pillars for sustainability of the results are in place, notably institutional capacity, private sector partnership on container management, and the integration of IPM into continuing programmes.</i>

¹⁶ **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.

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

¹⁷ **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

¹⁸ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

¹⁹ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

²⁰ 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)

Please describe the progress made in complying with the approved ESM plan. 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. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
Land, air and water pollution due to handling, transportation and disposal of the obsolete pesticides	- Developing an environmental management plan	- Maintaining an existing environmental management plan for the remaining obsolete stocks destined for disposal	- Implementation of the management plan and mitigation measures once the disposal of the remaining pesticides and associated wastes commences	- NPC in collaboration with the EAD
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
Poisoning and destruction of both terrestrial and aquatic habitats during the handling and transportation of the obsolete pesticides locally and abroad	- Developing an environmental management plan	- Initiation of the notification protocols under the Basel Convention for the transboundary movement of the wastes	- Obtaining PICs from waste transit territories	- Disposal contractor in liaison with the NPC
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
Not applicable				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
Not applicable				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
Pesticide resistance	- Limiting the use of obsolete pesticides to avoid resistance build-up	- Maintaining and monitoring the safeguarded obsolete pesticides to control pilferage	- Safe disposal of the safeguarded obsolete pesticides	- NPC in collaboration with CroLife and PCB
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
Not applicable				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
Child labour engagement	- Following the recommended local and international labour engagement standards	- Preventing child labour practices under the project - Collaborating with child labour programmes under the FAO Africa regional initiative	- Maintaining -non-engagement in child labour - Supporting efforts to prevent child labour at the national level and beyond	- NPC
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
Gender bias in labour engagement between males 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
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
Not applicable				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				
Persistence of the COVID-19 pandemic	- Following all preventive measures against the spread and contraction of the virus	- Following updates on the spread of the virus and all preventive measures	- Continue following the preventive measures	- All project implementers and partners

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
		- Getting a booster vaccine against the virus		

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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification
Category B (Moderate) ²²	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²¹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain. Still valid

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
No grievances received

²¹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

²² The Moderate correspond to the previous category B <https://www.fao.org/3/i4413e/i4413e.pdf> according to the former EIA Guidelines <https://www.fao.org/3/i2802e/i2802e.pdf>

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation (including COVID-19 related risks). The last column should be used to provide additional details concerning the manifestation of the risk in the project, as relevant.

	Risk	Risk rating ²³	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	The emergence of new local or global epidemic/pandemic infections and other human-health related matters such as the current Covid-19 pandemic	High	N	- Adjusting the implementation of activities in line with advisories from health authorities both locally and globally	- Integrating preventive measures in the implementation plans	- Teleworking once all work-related travel is suspended due to pandemics has been implemented
2	Insufficient funds dedicated to the remediation of the prioritized site and the disposal of POPs	Medium	Yes	- Budget revision and negotiating for co-financing with partners - If there is a need for additional co-financing, it will be availed from project partners and related projects during project implementation.	- The budget estimates for the disposal works have been revised based on the prevailing rates through budget revision to provide additional funds for remediation activities	- The PMU has constantly requested budget revisions to ensure adequate provisions for the activity

²³ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High

²⁴ 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 ²³	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Institutional arrangements pose challenges to project execution	Low	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation meetings with stakeholders were held and implementation arrangements were agreed upon during the preparation of the project. - Institutional arrangements, including the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, were confirmed again at the start of project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PMU continued engagement of responsible partners in the implementation of respective project components - Regular review of the partnership arrangements to call for timely support in cases of slack in participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There has been slackness among partners at times but the project PMU has always taken timely remedial actions
4	Increased pilferage of centralized stocks before repackaging and transportation for final disposal	Medium	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation meetings were held with SFFRFM to increase security at the premises. - Site securing and adequate training of staff at SFFRFM. - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducting routine monitoring for rapid response to pilferage - Sensitising the custodians of the stocks about the dangers of obsolete pesticides through a pesticide risk management approach i.e. pesticide resistance due to the use of ineffective obsolete pesticides 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pilferage of the obsolete dust grain protectants has increased over the project period
5	Likelihood of political instability	Low	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although there are currently no signs of unrest which could affect the project, this will be closely monitored during project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintaining neutrality during implementation - Constant monitoring of political instability and following security advisories from the department of safety and security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No incidence due to political instability occurred that affected the project activities
6	Extreme weather conditions such as torrential rain and floods	Low to medium	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Central stores holding the obsolete stocks are far from flood-prone areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consulting with weather experts and utilising regular weather update information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extreme weather conditions have not affected the stocks so far

	Risk	Risk rating ²³	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
7	Environmental contamination from leakage of POPs and other obsolete pesticides due to poor conditions of containers	High	Yes	- Management measures in the EMP include field procedures to ensure no further leakage occurs during the project activities	- Constant monitoring of the stocks for timely action such as repackaging the leaking obsolete stocks into new containers	- So far there has not been environmental contamination during project execution
8	Continued government centralised procurement of pesticides through parastatal companies will give rise to re-accumulation of obsolete stocks	High	Yes	- As part of component 3, the government and stakeholders will be engaged to develop pesticide policies that are more responsive to user demands and avoid large-scale procurements. - Under Component 4 developing communication strategies aimed at policymakers	- Periodic monitoring of pesticide usage at the commercial farmers' level and offering advisory services on the proper disposal - Revision of pesticide regulations including pesticide procurement processes and improving coordination among procurers - Demand-side management of pesticides by training farmers in the use of safer alternatives such as the integrated pest management	- There is better coordination among stakeholders in national pesticide procurement activities to avoid the accumulation of obsolete pesticides

	Risk	Risk rating ²³	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
9	Lack of appropriate storage for safeguarded stocks	Low	Yes	- Central stores conforming to FAO EA guidelines already identified and currently holding CLI safeguarded stocks in Lilongwe and Blantyre	- Monitoring at the storage facilities is periodically conducted to check if the stocks are properly maintained	- The prolonged storage has, however, denied the owners commercial use of the space occupied by the stocks hence a concern from the owners of the storage facilities
10	Local treatment of obsolete grain protectants in dust formulation not successful or are incomplete leading to leakage and run-off	Low	Yes	- The recommendation for bioremediation is to be based on product test results. Treatment according to researched method; use runoff and leachate control system	- Local disposal was cancelled following the US EPA revision of threshold values for outdoor exposure and environmental contamination of the active ingredients in the obsolete grain protectants - ESMP prepared for the disposal works - Conducted chemical analysis to check the environmentally damaging contaminants	- Government to consider disposal of the obsolete grain protectants through co-processing or in an engineered landfill.

	Risk	Risk rating ²³	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
11	Accidents/injuries during safeguarding and disposal of obsolete pesticides	High	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training and refreshing all personnel engaged in safeguarding operations. - Provision of protective gear to all workers by the international contractor. - The strict application of measures included in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and Health and Safety Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ESMP developed elaborating SOP and OSH procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During the previous exercises, staff were trained and PPE provided - SOPs were followed
12	Delays in the procurement of goods and services	Low	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equipment to be supplied as part of an international contract. Contractor to provide all necessary documents to (Government of Malawi) GoM to allow timely import 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project team conducts periodic meetings to strategise the submission of pending requests for procurement of goods and services - Conducting thorough preparations of requests such as providing adequate and accurate information as well as timely submission of requests for approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The local office procurement unit has worked in collaboration with the procurement unit at FAO headquarters to expedite the procurement of services
13	Government authorities disagree with the strategy for the reduction of risks posed by contaminated sites	Medium	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Developing the Strategy based on objective data and options presented to the government for endorsement. - Involving the government representatives (EAD) in disposal and remediation plans from the beginning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project team has suggested technically sound strategies based on the best technologies with assistance from qualified local and international consultants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There has been good cooperation between the project and government institutions on the activity

	Risk	Risk rating ²³	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
14	Delays in administrative procedures/decisions as regards transport of obsolete stocks	Medium	Yes	- Guidance of the competent Government authority as regards procedures of the Basel Convention has been provided. Protocols followed during the previous exercises to be followed	- The PMU has kept the custodian of the obsolete stocks updated on progress for disposal and maintained coordination with the regulatory bodies - Proactively seeking guidance from responsible regulatory authorities and timely submission of requests for clearances	- The competent authority has cooperated well
15	Technical staff being exposed to pesticides during collection and repacking of empty containers	Low to medium	Yes	- Training personnel on collection techniques for the safe collection, repackaging and storage of wastes and provision of Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) for all personnel involved in container collection	- The project provided personnel with PPE whenever working with or close to obsolete pesticide wastes - Trained technical staff in OSH	
16	Lack of stakeholder involvement in proper disposal of empty containers and the establishment of a sustainable system for the management of wastes.	Low	Yes	- Developing a strategy and conducting an awareness campaign and communication on the safe disposal of empty containers	- Key implementing partners – CroPLife, the EAD and the PCB - have actively participated in the activities	

	Risk	Risk rating ²³	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
17	Delayed adoption of updated legislation. Law making (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	Medium	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued sensitization during project execution including national training sessions and stakeholder meetings including awareness-raising targeting policymakers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There was a continuous follow-up at the Legal Bureau after the submission for final adoption and engaging the Legal Bureau staff in the revision to minimise the iterative corrections and enhance the chances of adoption 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The revised Regulations have since been adopted and are in use
18	Loss of IPM FFS facilitators after investment in Trainer of Trainers (ToT)	Medium	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project to enter into firms agreements with facilitators' institutions of origin (Department of Extension Services (DAES) and Department of CDCD); - Adopt the lead farmer strategy where farmers are trained to be facilitators. If found feasible, FFS study group members to include some youth above the minimum age of employment but below the age of 18, as this particular age group is vulnerable to engaging in hazardous child labour, while alternatives to chemicals can in some situations help to convert hazardous child labour into decent youth employment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Ministry of Agriculture adopted the FFS approach as a new extension methodology for all extension workers - Collaborating with other FAO projects to train all agriculture extension staff in FFS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Very good cooperation and coordination among FAO programmes and other agriculture development programmes at the national level supporting the project FFS approach

	Risk	Risk rating ²³	Identified in the Pro Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁴	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
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	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project collaborates with other FAO and national projects promoting resilience and CSA and building on existing community-based initiatives in close collaboration with DAES. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project team is part of the national training of farmers and extension workers in the control of the Fall Armyworm. Collaboration with projects that monitor plant pests and diseases Continuous monitoring of pests through a network at the farmer level and utilising advisory information from pesticide monitoring centres to take appropriate actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project so far collaborated with the CABI Plantwise project and other similar projects for pest monitoring purposes

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Substantial	Low	The COVID-19 pandemic has subsided and other risk factors of concern are low

7. Follow-up on Mid-term review or supervision mission (only for projects that have conducted an MTR)

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

The project did not undergo a mid-term evaluation recently and there was no supervision mission conducted. The implementation of the last mid-term recommendations has been reported from 2019 when the midterm evaluation was conducted and below is the latest reporting.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1: Timely procurement of goods and services – FAO should hasten the procurement of goods and services as required.	- Continuous vigilance by submitting procurement initiation documents timely and accurately
Recommendation 2: Management of pesticide containers – 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	- Local and international partners are leading the implementation of the empty container management
Recommendation 3: 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 for empty containers to the importers/suppliers of pesticides (see also recommendation 2)	- The project has continued to cooperate with the private sector. Currently, the private sector started utilizing the scheme and working towards finding the end-point for the shredded material. - The private sector is piggy-backing on the scheme to establish a more robust nationwide scheme with regional operating centres
Recommendation 4: The proposed changes for IPM FFS implementation should have been initiated timely and through a proper protocol 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	- The project has maintained the integration of the IPM activities through the FFS methodology working with other FAO and national agriculture programmes and projects
Recommendation 5: Stakeholder engagement should be enhanced at 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)	- The project has maintained a high level of stakeholder engagement in implementing its activities after working on the recommendation in subsequent years from the evaluation time

<p>Recommendation: 6 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"> - The project has mainly worked with the sugar, macadamia, tea and coffee sectors whilst the EAD has remained a key regulatory stakeholder
<p>Recommendation: 7 Communication (internal and external) and information exchange needs significant improvement. This shall include short, but regular meetings and weekly calls. Any issues and problems shall be addressed transparently and timely</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project has maintained timely team interaction and sharing of information
<p>Recommendation: 8 The project shall consider a no-cost project extension to achieve meaningful results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In March 2022, the steering committee requested a third no-cost extension to ensure the achievement of the key outputs

<p>Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">No</p>
---	--

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have a significant impact on the project objectives or scope or an increase in the GEF project financing by up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²⁵. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Describe the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	- Re-aligning the indicators	-	-
Components and cost	- Budget revision	- Mar/Apr 2022	- GEF
Institutional and implementation arrangements	- No change	- N/A	- N/A
Financial management	- No change	- N/A	- N/A
Implementation schedule	- In tandem with the third no-cost extension	- Jul 2022 to Mar 2023	- GEF
Executing Entity	- No change	- N/A	- N/A
Executing Entity Category	- No change	- N/A	- N/A
Minor project objective change	- No change	- N/A	- N/A
Safeguards	- No change	- N/A	- N/A
Risk analysis	- No change	- N/A	- N/A
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	- No change	- N/A	- N/A
Co-financing	- SelfHelp Africa dropped from co-financing	- At the beginning of the project implementation	- Steering committee
Location of project activity	- No change	- N/A	- N/A
Other	- N/A	- N/A	- N/A

²⁵ Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

Please report on progress and results and challenges on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan) included at CEO Endorsement/Approval during this reporting period.

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results in Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges to stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
<i>Ministry of Agriculture</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Providing overall direction regarding agriculture extension as for the FFS activities i.e. training farmers and extension workers in the use of safer alternatives to conventional pesticides and the development of IPM strategy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Ministry is supportive of the training of extension workers and farmers in pesticide risk reduction is going on. All extension workers are scheduled to undergo the training in phases - The trained extension workers are in turn training farmers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Persistent demand for allowances to engage in any activity is a challenge - Extension workers have a huge workload that makes them lose focus on their core functions as they serve as an entry point for all development initiatives in their areas
<i>Pesticides Control Board</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hosts the project management unit and provides oversight on pesticide legislation. It is the beneficiary of projects' efforts on institutional capacity building for sound pesticide lifecycle management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PCB has utilized the project support well by ensuring that staff underwent the planned training sessions to improve their capacity in pesticide management - With the technical support from the project, the PCB has evolved into a statutory institution and is continuing to improve its service delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although the PCB has evolved into a statutory corporation, it still faces understaffing that results in delays in executing some time-sensitive activities related to the project and its own
<i>The Environmental Affairs Department</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oversight of waste management as a waste management regulatory authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Good cooperation in the piloting of the empty container management scheme with the provision of the waiver to pilot the scheme and issuance of licences for handling and storing the empty containers and shredded materials 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of technical capacity in empty container management-related legislation - Delays in adopting global standards in declassifying rinsed empty containers from hazardous to non-hazardous due to inadequate flexibility
Non-Government Organizations (NGOs)			

Private sector entities			
<i>CropLife</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supporting the disposal of obsolete pesticides, remediation of pesticide-contaminated sites, the establishment of the empty container management scheme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identified personnel from the industry to undergo training in the operation of the empty container management equipment - Supporting the identification of an end-point for the shredded material, raising awareness among the industry on the piloted scheme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focuses more on the private sector leaving behind the smallholder farming sector -
Others[1]			
New stakeholders identified/engaged			
<i>Decent Rural Employment Team (ESP FAO HQ and RAF)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supporting the elimination of child labour and hazardous work in agriculture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collaboration in the local policy and legislation on child labour analysis and the identification of current and past efforts in child labour and hazardous work prevention in agriculture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - None

[1] They can include, among others, community-based organizations (CBOs), Indigenous Peoples organizations, women's groups, private sector companies, farmers, universities, research institutions, and all major groups as identified, for example, in Agenda 21 of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and many times again since then.

10. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.		
Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	No	- The project team is aware of the need to include a gender lens when executing the project activities.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?		- The focus regarding gender during the implementation of the project activities is on the prevention of child labour and hazardous work as well as the protection of other vulnerable groups such as women of childbearing age, and those with compromised immunity from pesticide risks.
Indicate in which result area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at the project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	No	- The project does not deal with issues relating to access and control over natural resources by women but rather access to extension services, particularly on pesticide risk management information
b) improving women's participation and decision making	No	- N/A
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	No	- N/A
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	Yes	- Data on farmers and extension workers engaged in the project activities is disaggregated when reporting
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	- The Project Coordinator is trained in gender mainstreaming at national and regional level.
Any other good practices on gender	N/A	- N/A

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities/products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project does not have a specific knowledge management strategy. The project collects and documents good practices through normal reports. - No specific good practice identified
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project has a communication strategy. The strategy covers reaching out to various groups with information on pesticide risk reduction such as farmers, extension workers and the public. As a success, the project in collaboration with CropLife produced and distributed posters on triple rinsing of empty pesticide containers.
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical and skills capacity building for staff at the PCB was one way of strengthening the legal and institutional capacity for sound pesticide lifecycle management. Among several staff training activities, the project assisted three staff to studying a postgraduate pesticide risk management course at the UCT. The three staff members are Mr Y Chakana, Mr L Banda and Mr B Mulima. They all graduated and Mr Chakana, who graduated with a distinction and Mr Mulima have now enrolled in a post-graduate Master's course to continue with their studies now on their own. The three staff remarked that the project support has assisted more in equipping them with skills and knowledge necessary for their respective roles as staff of the PCB. Mr Chakana said as a Principal Pesticide Analyst he has gained the needed knowledge enabling him to effectively review dossiers submitted for pesticide registration. As a chemist, he has added more knowledge on pesticide toxicology important for his work. <i>Before the training opportunities offered by the project, I was not able to evaluate the dossiers objectively. My evaluations were shallow compared to now,</i> said Mr Chakana. Likewise, Mr Banda and Mr Mulima who are both in the pesticides inspectorate said they have gained important knowledge through the course and other training sessions organised by the project helping them carry out the monitoring duties effectively.
Please provide links to the related website, social media account	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No separate website or social media account

2022 Project Implementation Report

Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	Training Extension Workers in Pesticide Risk Reduction – A case for Malawi Global Farmer Field School Platform Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (fao.org)
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	Jeff Chisale Jeffrey.Chisale@fao.org Towela Munthali Towela.Munthali@fao.org

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples and local communities involved in the project (as per the approved Project Document)? If yes, 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.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁶	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement/approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure <i>(confirmed by the review/evaluation team)</i>	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	2,000,000		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	314,396	0	400,000
Total in USD			11,879,374	10,537,146	1,300,000	11,879,374

²⁶ 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 the Project Document signature or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

The contributions from various co-financing partners have remained varied. In principle, the PCB and CropLife contributions have increased whilst the contributions from the Malawi Bureau of Standards, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Environmental Affairs Department have remained low. Furthermore, SelfHelp Africa stopped participating and co-financing as previously reported.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
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. A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project’s components and activities is in compliance with the project’s approved implementation plan.	
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.

Risk rating. It should assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.