



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP)	11
4. SUMMARY OF PROGRESS AND RATINGS	13
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	15
6. RISKS	18
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR)	25
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	26
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	27
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING.....	28
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	29
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	30
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE.....	31

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Malawi
Project Title:	Pesticide Risk Reduction
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
Initial project duration (years):	3
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> <i>a) Projects with 1st PIR;</i> <i>b) In case project activities' geographic coverage has changed since the last reporting period.</i>	N/A

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	1 October 2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	25 November 2015
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	24 December 2018
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	31 August 2023

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,550,000
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	11,879,374
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	2,506,351
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	2,226,828
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	7,595,907

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁵ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	17 March 2023
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	N/A
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	July 2019
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	March 2023
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Yes

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

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

Status

Implementation Status	Final PIR
------------------------------	-----------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Precious Chizonda, National Project Coordinator, FAO Malawi	Precious.Chizonda@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Zhijun Chen, FAO Representative in Malawi	Zhijun.Chen@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)	Shamiso Banda, Deputy Director for Environmental Affairs, Ministry of Natural Resources and Climate Change	shamiso_b@yahoo.com
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Mathew Abang, Plant Production and Protection Officer, Sub-regional Office for Southern Africa	Mathew.Abang@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex-Technical FLO)	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 corresponds to the previous category B 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 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 the project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	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 the safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of pesticide-contaminated sites	- Up to 240 tonnes of POPs and other obsolete pesticides are disposed of by high-temperature incineration.	- 390 tonnes of wastes inventoried in 2012 out of which 230 tonnes were repacked and centralized	- Risk reduction strategies for obsolete stocks developed, approved and safeguarding completed (with complete Environmental Management Plan (EMPs) and (EIA) - One contract signed for the disposal of	- Disposal of 390 tonnes of waste including 150 tonnes of low low-hazard grain protectant	- 215.717 metric tonnes of obsolete POPs and other pesticides disposed of in Sweden, 40.24 metric tonnes of chemical ash disposed of at a landfill in Uganda during 2017 and 2018 and - 10.23 tonnes of obsolete	HS

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). Refer to Annex 1.

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁹	Baseline	Mid-term Target ¹⁰	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹¹ since the project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹²
				obsolete pesticides		pesticides sent for disposal in the Republic of South Africa in June 2023	
		- 150 tonnes of degraded pesticide disposed of locally by the Government	- 150 tonnes of degraded and low-hazard dust grain protectant pesticide inventoried		- 150 tonnes of low-hazard dust grain protectant	- No grain protectants disposed	HU
		- Tons of soil treated/ One contaminated site remediated	- 382 tonnes of pesticide-contaminated soil - Four pesticide-contaminated sites identified, and no site remediated	- Risk reduction strategy for 1 contaminated site developed and approved - Implementation of long-term risk reduction strategies for one contaminated site	- Risk reduction in 1 prioritized contaminated site completed	- 40 tonnes of pesticide-contaminated soils excavated and sent for disposal in the Republic of South Africa	S
	Outcome 2: Health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their reuse are reduced	- Number of empty containers triple rinsed, collected, and stored awaiting recycling; 90% of all containers triple rinsed and collected/stored/ recycled.	- Of 55,000 containers generated annually, 5% are triple rinsed, none is collected and recycled - 75% of Known farms store	- 10,000 are triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling and /or disposal	- 45,000 containers are triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling and /or disposal. Legacy containers	- 25,000 empty plastic containers of diverse sizes triple rinsed and crushed - 18,000 legacy containers repackaged and sent for disposal	S

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁹	Baseline	Mid-term Target ¹⁰	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹¹ since the project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹²
			containers onsite - No data on unknown farms		that cannot be triple rinsed are disposed of under Outcome 1 if possible	under Outcome 1	
		- National policy/action plan based on the pilot adopted by the Government of Malawi EAD/PCB	- No national policy or action plan for empty container management	-	- A national policy and an action plan for empty container management based on the pilot	- No policy and action plan adopted based on the pilot. - Scheme piloted and discussions for the plan and its adoption continued.	MS
	Outcome 3: Legal and institutional frameworks strengthened for sound life cycle management	- Revised national legislation and regulations in compliance with international obligations developed	- No alignment between the pesticide legislation and Malawi's international commitments for pesticide risk reduction and does not enable effective pesticide life cycle management. - No IPM Policy in place	- Drafting the texts of the technical regulations and IPM Policy - Drafting the texts of the National Strategy &/or Action Plan (NSAP) for the implementation of the Code ensure sound life cycle	- Manuals of procedures and legal capacity development activities drafted - Draft IPM Policy submitted to Government for approval	- Pesticide regulations revised - IPM strategy developed and submitted to the government	HS

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁹	Baseline	Mid-term Target ¹⁰	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹¹ since the project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹²
				regulation of pesticides			
		- Endorsement of the National Strategy &/or Action Plan (NSAP) specifically pertaining to the implementation of the Code	- The PCB is the legislated body for pesticide registration and post-registration enforcement, but its operations are severely hampered by financial, technical, and human resource constraints	-	- Legal validation of regulations and NSAP - Monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of PCB.	- Five-year Strategic Plan for the PCB developed, validated and operationalized - Capacity building for the Pesticides Control Board (PCB) staff facilitated in FAO Pesticide Registration Toolkit - Three staff trained in pesticide risk management under the University of Cape Town Post Graduate Programme	HS
		- An information exchange platform hosted by the PCB to strengthen inter-governmental coordination on	- No formal mechanisms for the exchange of information e.g., for implementation of the Rotterdam		- National system for inspection and quality control of pesticides operational	- No information exchange mechanism in place for the implementation of the Rotterdam Convention	MS

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁹	Baseline	Mid-term Target ¹⁰	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹¹ since the project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹²
		hazardous chemical management validated and operational	Convention; new registrations etc.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National pesticide use survey conducted, and pesticide register reviewed - Fourteen active ingredients in 18 products were identified as highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs) based on the Joint Meeting on Pesticides Management (JMPM) criteria from the pesticides register and the pesticide use survey - Final Regulatory Action (FRA) prepared and submitted for the management of the identified problematic pesticides 	
	Outcome 4: IPM alternative to conventional	- IPM FFS implementation strategy validated in PY1	- A general implementation plan for Farmer Field School	- IPM Implementation strategy validated	-	- IPM implementation strategy validated.	S

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁹	Baseline	Mid-term Target ¹⁰	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹¹ since the project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹²
	pesticides successfully promoted and the use of chemical and highly hazardous pesticides reduced through farmer field schools		(FFSs) has been developed during the PPG in close consultation with the government				
		- A national cadre of national facilitators and 40 Farmer Field Schools building farmers' capacity on agroecological management of farming systems. 800 farmers trained through FFS	- 34 government officers (26 M/8F) trained on FFS approach and principles under TCP/MLW/3302 - No pesticide uses baseline.	- Farmers' practices and national capacity for promotion of IPM and other alternatives to chemicals to be determined in Yr1 - 1 Training of Trainers on cotton	- 1 training of Trainers on cotton and vegetables - 30 FFS established	- 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	S
		- % reduction in pesticide use on vegetables, cotton, and maize	-	- Short training on maize postharvest	-	- 1,570 farmers (988 female and 582 male) trained and practising in IPM FFS, focusing on maize, cotton	U

Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁹	Baseline	Mid-term Target ¹⁰	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹¹ since the project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹²
		among trained farmers		- 10 FFSs established		and vegetables (cabbages and tomatoes). - Over 50 FFS established during the project's lifetime	

Measures taken to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings in Section 2

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: Risks to human health and the environment are reduced through the safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and the remediation of pesticide-contaminated sites.	- The obsolete grain protectants were handed back to the government and stakeholders through the project steering committee for further consideration on finding financial resources to enable disposal by high-temperature incineration	- FAO through the NPC and CTA	- Completed during the last PSC meeting in March 2023
Outcome 2: Health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their reuse are reduced	- The piloted empty container management scheme was handed over to the implementing partners for continued dialogue with the government before developing and adopting a national implementation plan.	- FAO through the NPC and CTA	- Completed during the last PSC meeting in March 2023

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY (Fiscal Year) as per the Implementation Plan/Annual Work plan)

Outcomes and Outputs ¹³	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹⁴ (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year 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 1.1.2: 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	- 10.23 tonnes	- The annual target was an estimate, and the achievement is based on actual exercise
Output 1.1.3: Risks posed by 1 contaminated site are reduced	- Number of sites remediated	- 1	- 1	-
Outcome 2: Health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their reuse are reduced				
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	- Piloting phase has been prolonged, and the exercise is left with implementing partners

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 Work plan. 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 3.1: Legal and Institutional frameworks strengthened for sound life cycle management				
Output 3.1.1: National regulations developed and updated in conformity with international guidelines and submitted to the government	- No. of revised national legislation in compliance with international obligations developed	- 1	- 1	-

4. Summary of Progress and Ratings

Please provide a summary paragraph on progress, challenges, and outcomes of project implementation consistent with the information reported in sections 2 and 3 of the PIR (max 400 words)

During the first half of 2023, the disposal of the obsolete pesticides that remained from the 2017/18 exercise and the remediation of a pesticide-contaminated site were the key activities under Component 1. The two activities marked the end of implementation for the Component activities. These key activities prompted a six-month project extension from March to August 2023. The project was extended upon the request from the contractor working on the remediation of a contaminated site to allow soil excavation after the rainy season. The two activities were completed.

Taking advantage of the extension due to the remaining component 1 activities, activities on the empty container management scheme also continued. Fabrication of empty container collection booths to cater to smallholder farmers was carried out. Eleven collection booths were fabricated and handed over to the implementing partners through the Pesticides Control Board. The implementing partners will install the collection booths in the targeted districts as a continuation of the piloting.

The IPM strategy's development was finalized during the first half of the reporting period. This activity started during the second half of the last reporting period.

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.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating¹⁶	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁷	Comments/reasons¹⁸ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>The project has implemented the key activities under each component that have an overall contribution towards the global environmental benefits including the setting of examples on the management of obsolete pesticides, strengthening the legal and institutional capacity for the sound management of pesticide lifecycle including the management of empty containers and training farmers in the use of alternatives to achieve crop protection.</i>
Budget Holder	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>Key activities under each component have been achieved within budget and contributions made towards the project's global environmental benefit targets.</i>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁹	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>The project has successfully implemented the planned activities.</i>
Lead Technical Officer²⁰	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>The project successfully implemented the key activities under each component. Significant contributions have been made towards global environmental benefits. Administrative procedures such as reporting and terminal evaluation were successfully completed.</i>
GEF Technical Officer	Moderately Satisfactory	Satisfactory	<i>The project achieved most of the result targets that were set in its design, with some shortcomings. Implementation has been completed.</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)

This section is under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

Please describe the progress made to comply with the approved ESM (Environmental and Social Management) 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. Please indicate if new 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 during the handling, transportation and repackaging 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 during the handling and transportation of the obsolete stocks	- The National Project Coordinator 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 obsolete pesticides locally and abroad	- Developing an environmental management plan and obtaining transboundary movement consent from the transit countries	- Maintaining the EMP already prepared and obtained the Basel Convention transboundary movement consents from Mozambique and Zimbabwe as transit countries and import permit from RSA as the destination country	- Execution of the EMP and shipment of the wastes from Malawi after repackaging to RSA for disposal	- Veolia, the disposal contractor in liaison with the EAD
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
Not applicable				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and the Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
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	- The National Project Coordinator in

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts Identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
				collaboration with CropLife 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	- The National Project Coordinator
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, Ministry of Agriculture, and the Ministry of Gender
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
Not applicable – the country does not have a group of people classified as indigenous				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				
Cholera outbreak and the persistence of the COVID-19 pandemic	- Following all preventive measures against the spread and contraction of the pathogens	- Following updates on the spread of Covid 19 and all preventive measures. Likewise, following all preventive me	- 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: the project did not include an ESM Plan at the CEO endorsement stage

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

<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>
The project did not receive any grievance as per FAO and GEF ESS policies

²¹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (Esm-unit@fao.org) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf>)

6. Risks

The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified during the 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.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the Pro-Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	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 cholera outbreak and Covid-19 pandemic	Low	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 where necessary
2	Insufficient funds dedicated to the remediation of the prioritized site and the disposal of POPs	High	Yes	- Carrying forward into the next project the remaining obsolete stocks due to funding limitation caused by increased cost of disposal over time	The project has handed over the remaining obsolete grain protectants to government and partners for consideration into a new project	- FAO continues to over technical support for the disposal of the remaining obsolete pesticides in the subsequent projects

²² Risk ratings means a rating of 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: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the Pro-Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	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 	- 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	High	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 	- 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"> - Maintaining neutrality during implementation of project activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At present the political environment is calm compared to the time of the last elections and a year after the elections. Therefore, no mitigation measure being followed. 	- No incidence due to political instability occurred that affected the project activities

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the Pro-Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Extreme weather conditions such as torrential rain and floods	High	Yes	- Consulting with weather experts and utilising regular weather update information	- Following weather advisories issued by the Department of Climate Change	- Extreme weather conditions have not affected the stocks so far despite the country experiencing extreme flooding years during the implementation
7	Environmental contamination from leakage of POPs and other obsolete pesticides due to poor conditions of containers	Low	Yes	- Constant monitoring of the stocks for timely action such as repackaging the leaking obsolete stocks into new containers	- All obsolete pesticides with leakage potential have been repackaged pending shipment for disposal in RSA	- CropLife facilitated the cleaning of the leakage that occurred during the project formation
8	Continued government-centralised procurement of pesticides through parastatal companies will give rise to the re-accumulation of obsolete stocks	High	Yes	- Coordinating the procurement and donations of pesticides during crop pest and disease outbreaks among government and all development partners both local and international	- Pesticide Regulations revised to include pesticide procurement processes and improve coordination among procurers - Demand-side management of pesticides by training farmers in the use of safer alternatives such as the IPM	- Maintained coordination among stakeholders in national pesticide procurement activities to avoid the accumulation of obsolete pesticides

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the Pro-Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
9	Lack of appropriate storage for safeguarded stocks	Low	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requesting government to provide adequate storage space for the storage of the stock 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The stocks were stored properly with adequate space conforming to FAO guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The prolonged storage has, however, denied the owners the commercial use of the space occupied by the stocks hence a concern from the owners of the storage facilities. However, the government is responsible for the storage space
10	Local treatment of obsolete grain protectants in dust formulation not successful or are incomplete leading to leakage and run-off	Low	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changing the disposal route from land farming to a comparatively safer method such as high-temperature incineration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The local treatment of the obsolete grain protectants was cancelled following the revision of the outdoor exposure limits of the ingredients by the USEPA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The stocks were handed over to the government for consideration of a new disposal method
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"> - SOPs and OSH procedures outlined in the ESMP (Environmental and Social Management Plan) were applied during the repackaging and transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During the previous exercises, staff were trained, and PPE provided, and SOPs were followed

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the Pro-Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
12	Delays in the procurement of goods and services	High	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Timely initiation of the procurement processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project team conducted periodic meetings to strategize the submission of pending requests for the procurement of goods and services - Conducted 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"> - Some of the delays were beyond the control of the project team such as Covid 19 which constrained the supply chain at its peak. The procurement delays necessitated project extension three times
13	Government authorities disagree with the strategy for the reduction of risks posed by contaminated sites	Low	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collaborating with government institutions in all project-related aspects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project team engaged the EAD as a responsible entity for waste management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There has been good cooperation between the project and government institutions on the activity
14	Delays in administrative procedures/decisions as regards transport of obsolete stocks	High	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Timely submission of requests for support on procedures and decisions such as seeking the Basel Convention consents from the transit and recipient countries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PMU proactively sought guidance from responsible regulatory authorities and timely submitted requests for clearances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There were serious delays in obtaining transboundary movement consent as actions by both the national and foreign government authorities significantly delayed

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the Pro-Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
15	Technical staff being exposed to pesticides during collection and repacking of empty containers	Low to moderate	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 the proper disposal of empty containers and the establishment of a sustainable system for the management of waste.	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	-
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	Moderate	Yes	- Continued sensitization during project execution including national training sessions and stakeholder meetings including awareness-raising targeting policymakers	- 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	- Adoption of the revised Regulations was prompt due to the realisation of their importance

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²²	Identified in the Pro-Doc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
18	Loss of IPM FFS facilitators after investment in Training of Trainers (ToT)	Moderate	Yes	- Adopted the lead farmer strategy where farmers are trained to be facilitators.	- The Ministry of Agriculture adopted the FFS approach as a new extension methodology for all extension workers. Therefore, the Ministry aimed at training all extension workers in FFS methodology	- Particularly good cooperation and coordination among FAO programmes and other agriculture development programmes at the national level supporting the project FFS approach
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.	Moderate	Yes	- The project collaborates with other FAO and national projects promoting resilience, climate change adaptation and mitigation as well as pest surveillance	- The project team is part of the national training of farmers and extension workers in IPM and pesticide risk management. - Developed an IPM strategy for the country	- FAO support the country in monitoring various pests such as red locust, FAW, and African Armyworm, for timely responses

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Low	All the potential risks have significantly declined i.e., Covid 19 pandemic, Cholera outbreak and the political climate is calm.

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 in the supervision mission report.

No MTR was conducted during the reporting period and no supervision mission conducted

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation.....	
Recommendation.....	

No exit strategy was developed for the project

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	
--	--

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 of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²³. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as annexed to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results Framework	N/A		
Components and cost	N/A		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	N/A		
Financial management	N/A		
Implementation schedule	<i>Shifting of remediation activities at a contaminated site to June after the rainy season</i>	<i>The first quarter of 2023</i>	<i>Project Steering Committee and FAO-GEF Coordination Unit</i>
Executing Entity	N/A		
Executing Entity Category	N/A		
Minor project objective change	N/A		
Safeguards	N/A		
Risk analysis	N/A		
Increase GEF project financing by up to 5%	N/A		
Co-financing	N/A		
Location of project activity	N/A		
Other minor project amendments (define)	<i>Project no-cost extension from March 2023 to August 2023</i>	<i>February 2023</i>	<i>Project Steering Committee and FAO-GEF Coordination Unit</i>

²³ 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	Type of partnership	Progress and Results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges to Stakeholder engagement
Government institutions			
<i>The Environmental Affairs Department</i>	- Oversight of waste management as a waste management regulatory authority and NDA for Basel Notification arrangements	- The EAD provided support in obtaining the transboundary movement permits for the obsolete wastes from Malawi to RSA through Mozambique and Zimbabwe - Provided export permit for the obsolete pesticides	- Serious delays in processing the export permit for the waste and facilitation of the transboundary movement permits for the wastes leading to a six-month project extension from March to August 2023
NGOs²⁴			
Private sector entities			
Others²⁵			
<i>Decent Rural Employment Team (RAF)</i>	<i>Supporting the elimination of child labour and hazardous work in agriculture</i>	<i>Continuation of collaboration in the resource mobilization for reviving child labour work in the country</i>	- None
New stakeholders identified			

²⁴ Non-government organizations

²⁵ 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 is made at formulation or during execution stages.	Yes	<i>Gender consideration was made during formulation, but no specific actions were undertaken during the reporting period</i>
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?		N/A
Indicate in which results 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		N/A
b) improving women's participation and decision making		N/A
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women		N/A
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?		<i>No specific gender-disaggregated data was collected during the reporting period</i>
Staff with gender expertise	Yes	<i>The NPC is trained gender personnel who continued working on the project</i>
Any other good practices on gender		N/A

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities/products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval, during this reporting period.

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.	- The project had no specific knowledge-management strategy at CEO endorsement and during the reporting period. The Monitoring and Evaluation unit monitored and kept data that the project generated through reports and analysed progress against achievements of its outputs and outcomes through the results project framework
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the successes and challenges of the communications this year .	- The project had a communication strategy. However, implementation was weak. Pesticide risk management messages were prepared and submitted to the Pesticides Control Board for publishing.
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.	- No human-interest story was collected during the reporting period.
Please provide links to related websites, social media account	- None during the reporting period
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	- None during the reporting period
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	- Misheck Fombe at Misheck.Fombe@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.

If applicable, please describe the process and status of ongoing/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities.

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

The country does not have any group described as indigenous. As the project has been winding down during the reporting period, no community groups such as farmers in their communities were engaged. The implementation of the remaining activities did not call for such engagement.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²⁶	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²⁷	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement/approval	Actual Amount Materialized on 30 June 2023	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	200,000	200,000
NGO	Self Help Africa (SHA) ²⁸	In-Kind	1,158,359	-	-	-
National Government	Pesticides Control Board (PCB)	In-Kind	1,113,854	2,004,604	2,004,604	2,004,604
National Government (Statutory Organization)	Malawi Bureau of Standards (MBS)	In-Kind	350,000	-	-	-
National Government	Environmental Affairs Department (EAD)	In-Kind	360,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture	Grant	380,000	-	-	-
		In-Kind	2,243,000	1,682,250	1,682,250	1,682,250

²⁶Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²⁷Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

²⁸ Did not participate in the project implementation and did not co-finance the project

UN Agency	FAO	Grant	4,574,161	50,000	50,000	50,000
		In-Kind	400,000	2,359,053	2,359,053	2,359,053
Total in USD			11,879,374	7,595,907	7,595,907	7,595,907

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

Only CropLife, FAO and PCB have maintained and adequately co-financed the project. SelfHelp Africa dropped at the beginning of implementation whilst other government entities have not co-financed as per the initial commitments. All government institutions relied on the project's main source of funding to carry out or participate in the project activities.

Leadership and/or personnel changes in the co-financing institutions contributed to the poor co-financing due to misunderstanding of the project co-financing modalities by new staff. Subsequent discussions on the co-financing with the new people did not bring the same level of commitment as during the signing of the co-financing arrangements.

The Ministry of Agriculture co-financing in-kind is indirect through the implementation of FFS by its extension workers under other FAO projects namely Kulima and Prosper. FFS promotes IPM which is a core practice in pesticide risk management at the farmer level. The project was the first to promote FFS under FAO Malawi before Kulima and Prosper programmes ramped up the FFS activities.

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)	The 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)	The 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)	The project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. The project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environmental benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives
Unsatisfactory (U)	The project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environmental 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 environmental 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 will 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	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