



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	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, Irrigation and Water Development
Project Duration:	3 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	1 October 2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	25 November 2015
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	December 2018
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	24 June 2020
Actual Implementation End Date³:	

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,550,000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	11,879,374
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	1,556,160
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	1,316,066

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

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

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	30 November 2018
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	November 2018
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	June 2019
Mid-term review or evaluation is due in the coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation is due in the coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	Yes
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes

Ratings

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

Status

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

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Precious Chizonda, National Project Coordinator, FAO Malawi	Precious.Chizonda@fao.org
Chief Technical Advisor	Ivy Saunyama	Ivy.Saunyama@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Elisabetta Tagliati, Agricultural Officer Pesticide Life Cycle and POPs Focal Point Pest and Pesticides Management Team Food and Agriculture Organization of UN	Elisabetta.Tagliati@fao.org
Budget Holder	Zhijun Chen, FAO Representative in Malawi	Zhijun.Chen@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Kuena Morebotsane, TCID, FAO of the UN	Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	The level on 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): 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 disposed of by high-temperature incineration. - 150 tonnes of degraded pesticide dispose of locally by the Government - Tons of soil treated/ One contaminated site remediated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 390 tonnes of wastes inventoried in 2012 out of which 230 tonnes repacked and centralized by CLI in 2012 whilst 52 tonnes of which required repackaging - 150 tonnes of degraded and low hazard dust grain protectant pesticide inventoried destined for local disposal - 4 sites with approximately 382 tonnes of contaminated soil 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disposal of 390 tonnes of wastes 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 2 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 revisited - Preliminary site investigations and collection of soil samples conducted at six of the nine sites with potential pesticide-contamination 	S

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

⁸ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

⁹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Marginally Satisfactory** (MS), **Marginally Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	The level on 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
		identified in the inventory				
Outcome 2: Health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their re-use reduced through sound management of empty containers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10,000 empty containers triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Of 55,000 containers generated annually, 5% are triple rinsed, none is collected and recycled - 75% of known farms store containers on site - No data on unknown farms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishment of a sustainable empty container management system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10,000 are triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling and /or disposal - Legacy containers that cannot be triple rinsed are disposed under Outcome 1 if possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A feasibility study conducted on container management system establishment - A business model developed through a series of stakeholder meetings - A task force established that is leading the establishment of CMS - Two options for disposal of empty pesticide containers explored: incineration and recycling - Cooperatives for smallholder farmers identified for awareness raising - Triple rinsing and pesticide risk management communication materials developed 	MU

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	The level on 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 3: Legal and institutional frameworks strengthened for sound life cycle management of pesticides	- Revised national legislation and regulations in compliance with international obligations developed	- Ineffective and non-aligned pesticide legislation to international commitments for pesticide risk reduction in Malawi	- Drafting the texts of the technical regulations	- Revision of pesticide Act of Malawi to align to international commitments and to ensure effectiveness in achieving pesticide lifecycle management	- Text for the pesticides regulations drafted and presented to stakeholders - A five-year strategic plan for Pesticides Control Board elaborated - Capacity building for PCB staff facilitated in FAO Pesticide Registration Toolkit, risk reduction of Highly Hazardous Pesticides,	S
Outcome 4: 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	- No IPM Policy in place	- Training farmers in IPM and safe alternatives to chemical pesticides through the farmer field school	- Draft IPM Policy submitted to Government for approval	- Fourteen government extension staff (5 female) trained in new extension methodology of Farmer Field School (FFS) to further train farmers on safe alternatives to pesticides - 1,341 farmers out of which 847 are female and 494 male farmers trained and practising in IPM FFS focusing on maize, cotton and vegetables. 18 active ingredients in 16	MU

1. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	The level on 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					<p>products identified as HHPs based on the JMPM criteria from pesticides register and presented to stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National HHP survey conducted - FFS under the project integrated into other programmes implementing FFS 	

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
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"> - FAO Malawi to expedite the tender for laboratory services to analyse samples of the obsolete dust grain insecticide to inform the disposal route whether to be local or international and actual disposal method as well as soil samples from the pesticide-contaminated sites to develop conceptual models for remediation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Key stakeholders FAO in collaboration with CropLife International 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By the second third quarter of 2019
Outcome 2: Health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their reuse are reduced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finding a disposal solution for the legacy empty pesticide containers - Identification of local disposal routes for locally collected empty pesticide containers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The key stakeholders – FAO, the task force on empty container management and CropLife International, EAD, PCB and CropLife Malawi 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By the fourth quarter of 2019
Outcome 3: Legal and Institutional frameworks strengthened for sound life cycle management	N/A	N/A	N/A
Outcome 4: IPM alternatives to conventional pesticides successfully promoted and the use of chemical pesticides and highly hazardous pesticides reduced through Farmer Field Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrating the farmer field schools into existing programmes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FAO programme team and the project management unit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By the fourth quarter of 2019 before the commencement of the 2019/20 rain-fed production season

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

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1: A safeguarding and disposal strategy is developed in line with national and international best practice	Q2 Y1	- Established and trained a national task team for the disposal of hazardous wastes	- Updated disposal EMP		- Strategy for local disposal of degraded pesticides developed		- 100%	
Output 1.2: 390 tonnes of obsolete stocks and associated wastes are disposed of in an environmentally sound manner	Q4 Y2	- Tender for obsolete pesticides prepared and floated	- Contractor identified and conducted a verification exercise	- 255.957 metric tonnes of POPs, pesticide ash and other obsolete pesticides disposed of in an environmentally sound manner	- Testing the samples for the obsolete grain protectants in dust formulations		- 80%	- Disposal of the obsolete grain protectants in dust formulation has delayed due to delays in testing the samples

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

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

¹³ Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

Output 1.3: Risks posed by 1 contaminated site are reduced	Q3 Y3	- A local team trained in risk assessment of contaminated sites	- No milestones for this period	- Recruiting contractor to carry out remediation	- Revisiting the sites, conducting preliminary site investigations and collection of soil samples for analysis		- 30 %	- Remediation of contaminated sites and has delayed
Output: 2.1: Container management pilot implemented in Southern Regions of Malawi	Q4 Y3	- Awareness materials mobilised	- International empty and local container management consultants recruited	- Consultation meetings conducted - Feasibility study conducted - Business model developed	- Disposal and recycling options explored - Communication materials prepared and meetings initiated		- 40%	- Challenges in convincing potential recyclers to participate because of disputes with regulatory agencies and lack of understanding on the importance of empty container management scheme
Output 2.2: Assessment and scaling up of the Blantyre pilot scheme to a permanent operator completed	Q4 Y3	- No milestone for the reporting period	- No milestone for the reporting period	- No milestone for the reporting period	- Continued discussions with key stakeholders: the industry, government regulators such as EAD to find an endpoint for the collected empty containers		- 0%	- There has been a continued delay by CropLife Malawi in leading the implementation of container management system aggravated by continued wrangles between government and the industry regarding the ban on thin plastic papers, which the industry insists on producing
Output 3.1: National regulations developed and updated in	Q4 Y3	- Recruited a local and an international	- Reviewed regulations and drafted texts as	- Presented to stakeholders the drafted texts as	- Further revision of the regulations conducted		- 90%	

conformity to international guidelines and submitted to Government for approval		consultant	revision for the regulations	revision for the regulations	involving the Legal Affairs Bureau staff pending final submission to government for endorsement			
Output 3.2: Measures to strengthen the capacity of the Pesticide Control Board to enforce post registration Regulations developed	Q4 Y3	-	-	- Trained pesticides regulators on HHPs identification, risk assessment	- A five-year strategy for PCB elaborated		70%	
Output 3.3: National capacity for pesticide inspections and post-registration enforcement strengthened	Q4 Y3	- No milestone	- Trained 10 staff on post registration regulation of pesticides and FAO toolkit	- No milestone	- Measures for strengthening capacity on post-registration enforcement included in the strategic plan		70%	
Output 4.1: IPM FFS implementation strategy validated with key stakeholders	Q1 Y1	- Project work plan validated with stakeholders	- No milestone for the period	- No milestone for the period	- Already achieved		100%	
Output 4.2: Capacity building on IPM FFS on cotton, and vegetables, and maize in 3 ADDs (Salima, Shire Valley and Machinga)	Q4 Y3	- Conducted an assessment of the major problems on targeted crops leading to	- Trained 14 facilitators on FFS to build farmers' capacity on adaptive management	- An integrated FFS training curriculum on IPM, CSA and decent work being developed	- The IPM FFS approach being integrated into national FFS curriculum		80%	The project has not implemented FFS under the reporting period following a decision by FAO administration to integrate the FFS into the existing programmes that are

		heavy use of pesticides including HHPs.	t					also implementing FFS activities. Discussions are already underway between FAO and the key stakeholders to ensure the integration is smooth and to address challenges faced so far. The integration mainly seeks to achieve sustainability, optimization and harmonization of FFS in the country
--	--	---	---	--	--	--	--	--

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

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

Max 200 words:

Under component 1 - safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of heavily contaminated sites, the updated the inventory for the dust grain protectants. The stocks consist of 206.36 metric tonnes of pirimiphos-methyl + permethrin, 74.4 metric tonnes of malathion + permethrin and 21.86 of deltamethrin + fenitrothion. These are all dust formulations in PET bottles except 2.57 tonnes of pirimiphos-methyl + permethrin that is in sachets. The PMU continued following up the tender process for laboratory services for analyses of the insecticide samples was initiated during the last reporting period. The project recruited an international expert on contaminated soil remediation who conducted preliminary site investigations at seven sites suspected to be contaminated with pesticides across the country. The project continued discussions with CropLife International aimed at resource mobilisation and planning for the cleaning of the warehouses, shipment of obsolete stocks including the legacy empty containers to the disposal facilities as reported during the last reporting period.

Under component 2- management of empty pesticide containers, the project evaluated incineration and recycling options. It also developed communication materials and identified smallholder farmer cooperatives and radio stations to work with for the purpose of raising awareness on pesticide risk management and empty container management scheme.

In line with component 3 – strengthening the legal and institutional capacity for sound pesticide lifecycle management, the project finalized the review of the drafted text for the revision of pesticides regulations. It also continued with the capacity building of PCB staff in pesticide use monitoring through the analysis of the data of the pesticide use survey conducted during the last reporting period.

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

Max 200 words:

Disposal of the obsolete storage insecticides is still pending as a result of delays in securing laboratory contract for the analysis of samples, results of which will inform actual disposal options.

Implementation of contaminated soil remediation has fallen behind schedule as a result of delays in recruitment of international consultant for remediation of contaminated sites and further delays in securing contracts for laboratory services for of contaminated soil samples. Delays in procurement of container management equipment

There has been a continued delay by CropLife Malawi in leading the implementation of container management system aggravated by continued wrangles between government and the industry regarding the ban on thin plastic papers, which the industry insists on producing. The project has not implemented FFS under the reporting period following a decision by FAO administration to integrate the FFS into the existing programmes that are also implementing FFS activities. Discussions are already underway between FAO and the key stakeholders to ensure the integration is smooth and to address challenges faced so far. The integration mainly seeks to achieve sustainability, optimization and harmonization of FFS in the country.

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	<i>The administrative challenges such as delays in procuring goods and services as well as weak partner participation have persisted despite tangible progress during the reporting period.</i>
Budget Holder	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	<i>Implementation of activities has been slower during the reporting period.</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	Moderately satisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	<i>While the project has made overall satisfactory progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes, there have been significant delays in implementation of key activities such as the container management, IPM FFS and remediation of contaminated soils.</i>
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Moderately satisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	<i>Satisfactory progress in some components and delays in components 2 and 4. As the project is entering its final year of implementation we have to increase efforts to put implementation back on track and strengthen stakeholder participation and ownership plus collaboration with so the work and results may continue beyond the project.</i>

¹⁵ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

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

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	Yes, still valid

Please make sure that the below risk table includes also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning the manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant .

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

¹⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

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

²⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Insufficient funds dedicated to the remediation of the prioritized site and the disposal of POPs	Medium	Budget revision and negotiating for co-financing with partners	The budget revision carried out and negotiated with CLI to co-finance the disposal of remaining obsolete stocks and cleaning of warehouses	-
2	Institutional arrangements pose challenges to project execution	Low	Improving coordination	PMU has taken steps timely following up with partners on tasks and taking necessary remedial actions timely to limit delays	-
3	Increased pilferage of centralized stocks before repackaging and transportation for final disposal	Medium	Conducting routine monitoring for rapid response	The partners lead by PCB routinely conduct monitoring inspections at the warehouses to detect malpractices and take corrective decisions against the malpractices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The monitoring process detected pilferage during the reporting period for the obsolete grain protectants. Partners instituted corrective actions. - The observation underlines the need for quick disposal of the stocks

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Likelihood of political instability.	Low	N/A	The project team consults security institutions and utilises information from regular security updates	- The country has remained stable politically over the course of project implementation but the situation may change due to the results of 2019 tripartite elections. Hence there is constant monitoring of the security situation.
4	Extreme weather conditions such as torrential rain and floods	Low to medium	Consulting with weather experts and utilising regular weather update information	The project team utilises information from regular weather updates	- The country experiences severe droughts and floods but these do not affect project operations
5	Environmental contamination from leakage of POPs and other obsolete pesticides due to poor conditions of containers	High	Repackaging the leaking obsolete stocks into new containers	All obsolete pesticides in leaking containers were successfully repackaged and disposed of in an environmentally sound manner	- There was environmental contamination due to the poor condition of containers at the warehouses. FAO and CLI are mobilising resources for and preparing to undertake a cleaning exercise

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	Continued government centralised procurement of pesticides through parastatal companies will give rise to re-accumulation of obsolete stocks	High	Revision of pesticide regulations including pesticide procurement processes and improving coordination among procurers	The pesticide regulations have been revised pending submission and approval There is strong coordination on the importation of pesticides for responding to emergencies in the public health and agriculture sectors e.g. for fall armyworm response	- Monitoring reports indicate that the private sector and commercial farms are rapidly accumulating obsolete pesticides such that there are substantial quantities at the country level that require coordination for disposal through the regulatory authorities
7	Lack of appropriate storage for safeguarded stocks	Low	Improving surveillance monitoring of the stocks at the storage facilities	Monitoring inspections have increased at the storage facilities	- PCB has strengthened control over access to the warehouses by demanding written expression by those seeking access to the stocks
8	Local treatment of obsolete grain protectants in dust formulation not successful or are incomplete leading to leakage and run-off	Low	Conducting chemical analysis of the stocks to check the presence of environmentally damaging contaminants before disposal of locally	Continuous follow-up on the analysis of samples to determine proper disposal route whether local or international	-
9	Incidents during safeguarding/repackaging	High	Training in workers and the rest of the team members in occupational health and safety procedures	The contractor trained all workers and project team members before commencing the safeguarding works	Minor incidence of a foot injury was reported during repackaging and was medically handled

	Risk	Risk rating¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
10	Delays in the procurement of goods and services	Low	Conducting thorough preparations of requests such as providing adequate and accurate information as well as timely submission of requests for approval	The project team conducts periodic meetings to strategise submission of pending requests for procurement of goods and services	Delays in procurement have remained a significant challenge to the project despite the mitigation measures in place
11	Government authorities disagree with the strategy for the reduction of risks posed by contaminated sites	Medium	Engaging partners including government agencies to update and agree on a strategy for risk reduction from the pesticide-contaminated sites	The project team has held constant dialogue with key stakeholders including through PSC meetings throughout the implementation period	The outcomes of all dialogue meetings have been fruitful
12	Delays in administrative procedures/decisions as regards transport of obsolete stocks	Medium	Engaging responsible government agencies to expedite the clearances under the administrative procedures	The project team in collaboration with the contractor made constant follow-ups to responsible authorities for issuing transportation clearances	There was good collaboration among FAO, government and the contractor in dealing with delays experienced for the clearance to transport pesticide wastes to Uganda through Tanzania
13	Technical staff being exposed to pesticides during collection and repacking of empty containers	Low to medium	Providing appropriate PPE to technical staff for use during collection and repackaging of pesticide wastes including empty containers	Staff are always provided with PPE whenever working with or close to obsolete pesticide wastes	The project also trains staff and partners before working with obsolete pesticide wastes or contaminated sites

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
14	Lack of stakeholder involvement in proper disposal of empty containers and in the establishment of a sustainable system for the management of wastes.	Low	Planning for routine engagement of stakeholders and sharing of updates to show progress on the establishment of the sustainable empty container management scheme	The project PMU shares updates through the ECM task force and	The dispute between regulatory authorities and the plastic manufacturing industry as well as the weak participation of CLM has significantly delayed progress increasing the risk
15	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	Medium	Submission of quality documents to minimise iterative corrections and enhance chances of adoption	Engaging the legal affairs department during the early stages of the review process of legislative documents	Change in government focus may increase the delay
16	Loss of IPM FFS facilitators after investment on ToT	Medium	Engaging the Department of Agriculture Extension Services to provide extension officers to undergo ToT for IPM FFS, not senior officers who are prone to transfers	Only one out of the 16 trained officers was a senior officer but the rest are extension officers working with farmers directly	So far the attrition has been low and mainly due to retirement whilst transfers are within districts
17	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	Continuous monitoring of pests through a network at the farmer level and utilising advisory information from pesticide monitoring centres to take appropriate actions Participating in the national efforts towards climate change and pest management coordination teams	The project team is part of the national training farmers and extension workers in the control of the Fall Armyworm, <i>Spodoptera frugiperda</i> . The project assists in the preparation of technical specifications for the procurement of pesticides for the control of emerging pests	

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Low	Low	The overall risk remains and it is anticipated that the ongoing disagreements over the results of the May 21 2019 tripartite elections will be resolved in the courts.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months²¹

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	Yes	
Project Outputs	Yes	The management at FAO Malawi has proposed for the project outcome for training farmers in alternatives to conventional pesticides through IPM farmer field schools be changed. The proposal is to integrate the IPM FFS into the mainstream national IPM FFS. The proposal is yet to be discussed with both PMU and PSC.

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start-up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: December 2018 Revised NTE: June 2020</p> <p>Justification: Some activities have taken more time to implement than expected. Therefore, more time is required for implementation. Such activities include the rolling out of the empty container management system, remediating pesticide-contaminated sites, finalizing the disposal of obsolete pesticides and finalizing the strengthening of the legal and institutional capacity under PCB for better management of pesticide lifecycle.</p>

²¹ Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

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

5. Gender Mainstreaming

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

The project did not make a gender analysis. However, the project recognizes the role that women play in the agriculture sector where they supply most of the labour along with the agriculture value chain in the agriculture sector. The project also recognizes the need for decent employment and the need to eliminate child labour in the agriculture sector.

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

7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

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

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project;
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

The project has five major stakeholders namely the Ministry of Agriculture within which there is Pesticides Control Board, Department of Agriculture Extension Services, Department of Agricultural Research Services and the Department of Crops Development, the Environmental Affairs Department, Malawi Bureau of Standards, SelfHelp Africa and CroLife Malawi/International. These are the stakeholders included in the project design and they are the co-financiers of the project both in kind and in monetary terms. The project has over the reporting period engaged all the partners except SelfHelp Africa through the established project Steering Committee. The project shared implementation updates and sought consensus on dealing with implementation challenges such as analyzing the remaining obsolete pesticides in dust formulation in order to decide on the disposal method. There were also specific ways in which the project engaged the specific partners as outlined below:

The following section outlines how the project has engaged each partner:

a) *Ministry of Agriculture*

As a host for the PMU and with the government focal point person for the project, the stakeholder is involved in planning for any meeting with other stakeholders including sending the invitations on behalf of the project. The project directly implements component 3 with PCB which is the main beneficiary of the activities under component 3. The project facilitates capacity building and the revision of the legal capacity through the revision of the pesticides regulation and supporting the development of a strategic plan of implementation.

b) *Environmental Affairs Department*

The project engaged EAD on matters relating to remediation of pesticide-contaminated sites across the country. EAD personnel are directly involved and trained in remediation processes. The project further engaged EAD on matters relating to the review of pesticide regulations. The stakeholder is an implementing partner for the disposal of obsolete stocks including the remediation of contaminated sites and the establishment of an empty container management scheme.

c) *Malawi Bureau of Standards*

The project engaged the Bureau on matters relating to analyzing the samples of the obsolete pesticides in dust formulations that the project must facilitate disposal of. The stakeholder is an implementing partner for the disposal of obsolete stocks and the establishment of an empty container management scheme.

d) *SelfHelp Africa*

This is a Non-Governmental Organisation implementing agricultural projects which is a co-financier for component 4 of the project i.e. training farmers on the use of safer alternatives to the conventional pesticides. The stakeholder was engaged by requesting for co-financing reports during the reporting period. However, the stakeholder has not actively participated in the project implementation as expected due to misunderstanding over the co-financing mechanism.

e) *CropLife Malawi/International*

The stakeholder is the implementing partner for components 1 and 2 and leads the task force put in place to implement activities for establishing an empty container management scheme. However, CropLife Malawi was inactive for the most part of the reporting period such that during one of the task force meetings, it was agreed that the PMU steps up to take the roles of CropLife Malawi in order to revive the implementation of activities under the component.

f) *Illovo Sugar and farmer cooperatives* are some of the stakeholders that the project has worked with during the reporting period mainly on the establishment of an empty container management scheme.

g) *OG Plastics* was engaged during the reporting period as a potential recycler of empty pesticide containers. The project assisted the company to initiate the carrying out of an environmental audit in order to get certification for recycling empty plastic containers from the pesticide industry.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieving the expected global environmental benefits
- Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

So far the project has not produced knowledge management materials during the reporting period. However, the project team has worked with the container management task force/CropLife, ministry of agriculture and the communication department under FAO to produce different information communication materials (brochures, leaflets, posters) on general pesticide risk management targeting the public and specifically farmers. The project intends to work with radio stations to produce programs with information on pesticide risk reduction. An information brochure for the project is under final revision towards final publication. The aim is to share information profiling the project objectives and progress achieved so far.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement/approval US\$	Actual Amount Materialized on 30 June 2019 US\$	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team) US\$	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project US\$
NGO	SelfHelp Africa	Grant	1,158,359.00	0	0	1,158,359.00
Private Sector	CropLife	Grant	1,250,000	30,000	30,000	1,250,000
		In-kind	50,000	0	0	50,000
National Government	PCB	In-Kind	1,113,854	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,113,854
	MoAIWD	Grant	2,243,000	0	0	2,243,000
		In-Kind	380,000	0	0	380,000
	EAD	In-Kind	360,000	100,000	100,000	360,000
Statutory Cooperation	MBS	In-Kind	350,000	0	0	350,000
Multilateral UN agency	FAO	Grant	4,574,161	50,000		4,574,161
		In-Kind	400,000	136,066		400,000
		TOTAL	11,879,374	1,316,066	1,130,000	11,879,374

²² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multilateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

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

As the project is being implemented now, there has been a significant time lag between the time the project was designed and the partners made the co-financing commitments such that changes at partner level have resulted in a misunderstanding of the co-financing arrangements. There have been difficulties in getting co-financing reports from partners. In some cases, partners have not contributed at all towards their co-financing commitments.

The project engaged all the partners by sharing with them the signed co-financing letters to remind them of their commitment and also proposed to have a meeting with the partners that would involve the national GEF focal point person under the EAD. No partner submitted a co-financing report as expected and the meeting did not take place since the administrative lead person for the project at FAO Malawi opted to engage the partners directly. However, this did not succeed. Therefore the above figures indicated as co-financing contributions are mere estimates by the project PMU except for the grant contributions from GEF.

Annexe 1. – GEF Performance Rating Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Rating definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve 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 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 – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Rating definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.