



## **FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report 2022 – Revised Template**

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

### **Table of contents**

<b>1. BASIC PROJECT DATA .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>6. RISKS .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR) .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>13. CO-FINANCING TABLE .....</b>	<b>42</b>

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Latin America and the Caribbean
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Uruguay
<b>Project Title:</b>	Strengthening Capacities for the Sound Management of Pesticides Including POPs (MSP)
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/URU/031/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	5144
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Chemicals & Waste
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Environment (MA) – (formerly MVOTMA)
<b>Project Duration (years):</b>	42 months / 3,5 years
<b>Project coordinates:</b>	3441575; 3441242; 3440054; 3442988; 11820844

### Project Dates

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	9 March, 2015
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	4 January, 2016
<b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	19 December, 2021
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if approved) <sup>2</sup></b>	31 December, 2022

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	1,874,028
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>3</sup>:</b>	7,258,000
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b>	1,866,746
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022<sup>5</sup></b>	9,457,200

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

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

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

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

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

**M&E Milestones**

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:</b>	24 Dec, 2020.
<b>Expected Mid-term Review date<sup>6</sup>:</b>	Non applicable
<b>Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):</b>	June 2018
<b>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date<sup>7</sup>:</b>	December 2022
<b>Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)</b>	Yes

**Overall ratings**

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

**ESS risk classification**

<b>Current ESS Risk classification:</b>	Moderate
---	----------

**Status**

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

**Project Contacts**

<b>Contact</b>	<b>Name, Title, Division/Institution</b>	<b>E-mail</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Sebastián Viroga, National Project Coordinator	<a href="mailto:sebastian.viroga@ambiente.gub.uy">sebastian.viroga@ambiente.gub.uy</a>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Gonzalo Kmid, Assistant FAOR Programme, FAO Representation in Uruguay (FAOUY).	<a href="mailto:gonzalo.kmaidricetto@fao.org">gonzalo.kmaidricetto@fao.org</a>
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Oxana Perminova, Agricultural Officer, AGPM FAO	<a href="mailto:Oxana.Perminova@fao.org">Oxana.Perminova@fao.org</a>

<sup>6</sup> The Mid-Term Review (MTR) should take place after the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

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

<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	Valeria Gonzalez-Riggio, Natural Resources Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit (OCB)  Lorenzo Campos Aguirre a.i. FAO RLC GEF Task Managere	<a href="mailto:valeria.gonzalezriggio@fao.org">valeria.gonzalezriggio@fao.org</a>  <a href="mailto:Lorenzo.camposaguirre@fao.org">Lorenzo.camposaguirre@fao.org</a>
------------------------------------	--	--

## 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 <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
To safely dispose of obsolete pesticides including POPs and containers, and to strengthen the lifecycle management of pesticides in Uruguay	<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Risks to human health and the environment reduced through safe disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides and through built capacities on remediation of pesticide-contaminated soil.	Waste management plans to prevent further accumulation of pesticide stockpiles and empty pesticide containers.  Management Plans budgeted and implemented.	Management plans have been developed.		Management Plans budgeted and implemented.	<b>100%</b> The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) was delivered to DINAMA (now DINACEA) in 2017 by the civil organization "CampoLimpio" (CL). In February 2020 the EMP was signed and notified to CL.  During 2020 and 2021, CL negotiated with different service providers to be able to implement the EMP with the priority of being able to disposal obsolete pesticides locally, avoiding export.  This entire process involved negotiations and monitoring by the Ministry of Environment (MA).	<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>

<sup>8</sup> This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

<sup>9</sup> Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

<sup>10</sup> Please report on results obtained in terms of Global Environmental Benefits and Socio-economic Co-benefits as well.

<sup>11</sup> 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)**.

		<p>Obsolete pesticides, including POPs pesticides, disposed of in an environmentally sound manner.</p>	<p>0 Tons</p>		<p>160 Tons.</p>	<p>The possibility of elimination at the local level implies that the companies involved in the execution of the EMP, need to be authorized by the MA to carry out this process.</p> <p>Currently CL has prepared and budgeted the cost of the EMP execution and is waiting for the MA authorization mentioned previously to start.</p> <p>On June 2021, the Ministry of the Environment approved request EM2021/14000/003824 that enables the storage authorization for obsolete stocks presented by CL.</p> <p><b>0%</b> As already reported, the elimination of 160 tons obsolete pesticides will not be completed in the project lifetime. However, the approval of the EMP (as a requirement of the Decree 152/13) obliges the private sector - through CL – to handle the sound elimination of obsoletes, and represents a guarantee that the stock detected by the survey will be disposal in the near future.</p> <p>In December 2021 after many negotiations, a Letter of Agreement (LoA) was signed to execute the funds foreseen by the project as support and impulse the execution of the EMP during 2022.</p> <p>The LoA has 3 products;</p>
--	--	--	---------------	--	------------------	--

					<p>1- Selection of the obsoletes to eliminate.</p> <p>2- Collection and storage of these obsoletes</p> <p>3- Elimination of the obsoletes.</p> <p>Until now, the Product 1 was completed. The service provider presented a proposal for execute the obsolete elimination to the national authority in May 2022. This approval is necessary to complete in order to advance with Product 2 and 3.</p> <p>By the time of this report, the authorization request mentioned above (Ex N° 2022/36001/005447) had a positive technical answer and we are waiting for the resolution to be signed by the Environment Minister.</p> <p><b>It will be the first experience</b> in the Country for disposal of obsolete through a <b>national solution</b> and will make it possible to <b>disposal of a maximum of 20 tons (in the LoA)</b>. In addition, it will be a EMP testing in order to adjust the mechanism for the future.</p> <p><b>Risk Level is Medium-Low.</b></p> <p>Based on the evidence listed below, it is understood that the Risk Level is Medium-Low.</p> <p>Strengthening of the Container Plan and the NGO CL (Product 1.15).</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

Risk level: Medium-High risk (according to DINAMA and MSP assessment)

Risk level: High risk (according to DINAMA and MSP assessment)

Risk level: Medium-High risk (according to DINAMA and MSP assessment)

					<p>Environmental Management Plan (EMP) approved.</p> <p>Obsolete survey (Synthesis inventory survey carried out in 2020) identifies that 88% of the surveyed stocks are in good condition, loss (1%), unknown (11%).</p> <p>In December 2021 a LoA was signed to execute the funds foreseen by the project as support and impulse the execution of the EMP during 2022.</p> <p>Finally, everything mentioned above is supported by Decree 152/013.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome 1.2:</b> Capacities developed for site remediation.</p>	<p>Enhanced capacities of private sector organizations.</p>	<p>No capacity building programme in place</p>		<p>Enhanced capacities of private sector organizations.</p>	<p><b>100%</b> In Uruguay, spills and contaminated sites are managed by the operations of National Direction of the Firefighters and are not handled by the private sector. Hence, CL was not going to deal with highly deteriorated stockpiles.</p> <p>In 2017 it was decided to focus this objective at the farm level, dealing with situations that can be managed by producers and workers.</p> <p>During 2018-19 the “Guide for prevention and action facing incidents / accidents in the manipulation of agricultural pesticides” was developed. It presents tools for the prevention and mitigation of possible risky events. It was validated by the counterparts of the project. (<a href="#">Link</a>)</p> <p>Starting from the second half of 2019, training courses were implemented to disseminate such tools.</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory (S)</b></p>



					<p>Between 2019 and 2020, 127 farmers and rural students have been trained with significant results.</p> <p>The Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP) and some Associations demonstrated interest in including the Guide in the training courses that it provides to the private sector. For this reason, a new edition and printing was carried out in 2021, seeking a significant increase in dissemination and impact, beyond the project deadline. Since 2021 the MGAP have trained more than 500 workers working in the pesticides application.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Legislative and regulatory framework for the environmentally sound management of POPs and pesticides is improved.</p>	<p>Pesticides or POPs pesticides regulations in place.</p> <p>Regulation is enforced with corresponding Budget</p>	<p>Pesticides or POPs pesticides regulations in place.</p> <p>Regulation adopted but is not enforced</p>		<p>Pesticides or POPs pesticides regulations in place.</p> <p>Regulation is enforced with corresponding Budget</p>	<p><b>100%</b> Proposals for improvement of regulations were developed and delivered for 4 out of the 5 stages of the pesticide’s life cycle: Use / Application, Storage, Transportation, Import (proposal for the improvement of pesticides registration).</p> <p>As additional activities that contribute to the outcome, two proposals (not initially planned) were elaborated: two studies for the search and selection of Biomarkers of pesticides exposure, and the development of a Surveillance Program for Workers who were exposed to agricultural pesticides.</p> <p>The Uruguayan authorities now have got a proposal for the improvement of the National Registry of Pesticides (include the Environmental Risk Evaluation). In 2021 the Minister of MGAP and MA agreed to implement the Environmental Risk</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory</b> (S)</p>

					<p>Evaluation in the Registry of Pesticides. Such a proposal will imply a significant change in the way the pesticides that enter the country are evaluated and authorized. The attainment of this collaborative working experience, involving the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment on such a controversial matter, and the development of a proposal for registry improvement with the support of the FAO international consultant, were important challenges and represent relevant achievements. In addition, the Ministry of Agriculture has begun some actualizations, based on the proposals that were delivered. (<a href="#">Link</a>)</p> <p>It is highlighted that the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) is responsible for the delivery of technical inputs and normative proposals, while normative approval is a political decision.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome 3.1</b> The use of toxic pesticides reduced through the adoption of IPM and other alternatives.</p>	<p>200 tons of reduced toxic pesticides</p>			<p>200 tons of reduced toxic pesticides</p>	<p>Different management strategies have been evaluated to reduce the use of pesticides, and the impact on environment and health without negatively affecting the production.</p> <p>The project is reporting that it does not present the tools to ensure the sustainability of the producer's adherence to these alternative practices validated. Because on one hand, these changes involve longer processes than the life cycle of a project and on the other hand, the project proposed achieve this results only through training and dissemination of strategies validated in the field. So, we</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory (S)</b></p>

					<p>cannot guarantee the reduction quantitatively.</p> <p>The Project has not directly measured this result indicator, for the reasons mentioned above.</p> <p>However, the project generated information that allows us to affirm that progress was made towards achieving this result. Based on that, we consider this result as "Satisfactory" because:</p> <p>(1) the evaluation of the strategies showed that the goal can be achieved by implementing them in approximately 10% of the planting area at the national level; the strategies do not have any negative impact on production and their costs of implementation is equal to or cheaper than chemical alternatives;</p> <p>(2) the project realized a interviews to "qualified actors" of the agricultural sector to indirectly estimate the adherence of the producers to the developed practices: the experts agreed that there is an increasing interest for applying these tools and that there is an increasing number of producers innovating on their implementation (e.g: <a href="#">Link</a>)</p> <p>(3) both the Academy and the Agricultural Research Institute (INIA) continue to work on cover crops and rolling, and other organizations have started an adoption process; (<a href="#">Link</a>); (<a href="#">Link</a>); (<a href="#">Link</a>)</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>(4) the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries in 2020 presented a Conceptual Note to continue deepening the changes initiated with this project.</p> <p>In summary, the project has generated information and evidence that show that a process of change has been triggered towards the achievement of the indicator result; as has already been reported, for these kinds of transformations that imply cultural changes and are voluntary, longer processes are expected and longer timings are needed to see the final results.</p> <p>The interest of the government, the Academy and the private sector to continue to work on these topics ensures the sustainability of the achievement in the future, although it is a process that has just begun. The progress in rolling, bio-inputs, plant covers and biological beds stands out. <a href="#">(Link)</a>; <a href="#">(Link)</a></p> <p>For example in October 2021 in the "IV National Symposium on Agriculture" one of the main blocks of the event was dedicated to Service Crops. All the information exposed there was generated within the framework of the project together with the Faculty of Agronomy <a href="#">(Link)</a>. This event is the most important biannual technical event in the country about agricultural sector, showing the relevance that has gained the topic and the positive impact of the project activities.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>Based on these results, trainings and dissemination activities are being developed to promote these tools.</p> <p>Training events in field days and theoretical expositions were held in the country. Until the date of this report <b>more than 1200</b> people have been trained in promoting good agricultural practices that encourage (among other things) a reduction in the use of pesticides.</p> <p>Based on the observations made by the Final Evaluators and with the aim of not reporting the same information in two different products, the previously reported activities were divided between product 3.1.3 and 3.2.1.</p> <p>It should be noted that although the change was agreed, this criterion is not shared by the PCU or by the project counterparts, because all the activities carried out contribute incrementally to the achievement of both outcomes, since the training is also considered an instance of awareness and dissemination.</p>	
<p><b>Outcome 3.2</b> Increased awareness on the effects of conventional pesticides and on alternatives available</p>	<p>Medium-level (as assessed by DINAMA)</p>	<p>Low level awareness (as assessed by DINAMA)</p>		<p>Increased awareness as perceived by officials and producers</p>	<p><b>100%</b> This indicator is qualitative and subjective, because it depends on the opinion of one of the interested parties. This was a limitation to measure it.</p> <p>As a strategy to overcome this limitation, inputs were generated that allow a qualitative approach to the situation and to be able to make an approximation that</p>	<p><b>Satisfactory (S)</b></p>

					<p>reasonably allows us to say that objective 3.2 has been met.</p> <p>Surveys of the training and dissemination activities were analyzed and through interviews with "qualified experts" in relation with your perception about the topic in relation with the project actions and their impact.</p> <p>Based in the result of this analysis, we could say, that the awareness on the effects of conventional pesticides and on alternatives available was increased.</p> <p>The communication was focused to producers. This has the advantage of raising awareness with transferring technological development findings. Technical and economic factors drive them to change practices and their awareness is increased.</p> <p>Along the project <b>980 people</b> were participate in specific training module developed in 3.2.1 output. But <b>more than 2200 people</b> were participated in different project activities in relation with Good Practices in Agriculture, Manage pesticides and the risk associated (output 3.1.3 and 3.2.1)</p> <p>In addition, very useful materials were elaborated to work on the increase of awareness to support trainings and dissemination activities. Those items, such as publications, videos, leaflets and guides, will remain available to local institutions</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					for their use in future activities. For instance; <a href="#">(Link)</a> ; <a href="#">(Link)</a> ; <a href="#">(Link)</a> ; <a href="#">(Link)</a> ; <a href="#">(Link)</a>	
<p><b>Outcome 4.1</b> Enhanced capacity for monitoring and timely response to Pesticide risks to human health and the environment.</p>	<p>Medium-level of capacities (as measured by DINAMA and MSP)</p>	<p>Medium-low level of capacities (as measured by DINAMA and MSP)</p>		<p>Medium-level of capacities (as measured by DINAMA and MSP)</p>	<p><b>100%</b> The laboratories of MA and DGSA serve for different purposes however they developed and validated multi-residue methods and were accredited for the analysis of pesticides residues in environmental matrices (DINAMA) and food like cereals and grains (DGSA). They were ready to be accredited in the ISO 17.025 standard. This gives a level of harmonization in their work. The variety of pesticides that could be detected by the method was increased considerably during the Project span.  In 2021 the DINAMA Laboratory was accredited in the ISO 17025 standard, 27 pesticides in the water matrice.  The monitoring activity in “Laguna del Cisne”, performed in coordination with the National University and MA generated baseline information for the watershed. More than 84 pesticides were monitored during one year; besides, the knowledge on pesticides dynamics was deepened with the aim of improving environmental monitoring in the future. Finally, a protocol for analytical procedures was developed, including methodological as well as logistic aspects, to coordinate future action of different institutions at the field and analysis levels.</p>	<p><b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b></p>

						These lessons learned are being applied in the second monitoring in the San Salvador (Soriano) basin.	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p><b>Outcome 1.1</b> Risks to human health and the environment reduced through safe disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides and through built capacities on remediation of pesticide-contaminated soil.</p>	<p>Currently, it corresponds to the minister of the environment to sign the resolution that authorizes the use of the oven to locally eliminate the obsolete pesticides selected within the framework of the project.</p> <p>The PCU needs to insist to move forward with this authorization in order to fully execute the first local obsolete pesticide elimination.</p>	<p>By Ministry of Environment, "CampoLimpio" (CL)</p>	<p>August 2022</p>



### 3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<b>Outcome 1.1</b>				
<b>Output 1.1.2</b> Staff of DINAMA, MGAP, FAGRO and local governments are trained in obsolete pesticides and contaminated sites	80 people	-	100 %	No change from previous report.
<b>Output 1.1.3</b> Completed inventory of stocks of obsolete pesticides, including POPs.	Annual inventory completed  The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) proposed	1	100%  100%	No change from previous report.  No change from previous report.
<b>Output 1.1.4</b>	160 Tons of obsolete pesticides including POPs, disposed of in accordance with the Basel and Stockholm Conventions		0%	In December 2021 it was signed a Letter of Agreement (LoA) to

<sup>12</sup> Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

<sup>13</sup> Please use the same unit of measurement of the project indicators as per the approved Implementation Plan or Annual Workplan. Please be concise (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

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

<p>Strengthened capacity of the private sector for the elimination of obsolete pesticides, including POPs and empty containers</p>	<p>30 members of producer organizations and commercial companies of agrochemicals trained in obsolete management (annually)</p> <p>30 operators and technicians trained in packaging management (annually)</p>		<p>100%</p> <p>100%</p>	<p>execute the funds foreseen by the project as support and impulse the execution of the Environmental Management Plan during 2022.</p> <p>The LoA has 3 products;          1-Selection of the obsoletes to eliminate.          2-Collection and storage of these obsoletes          3-Elimination of the obsoletes.</p> <p>Until now, the Product 1 it was completed.          The service provider presented to the national authority a proposal for execute the obsolete elimination. This step is necessary because they need an authorization by the MA to advance with Product 2 and 3.</p> <p>It will be the first experience in the Country for eliminate obsolete throw a national solution.</p> <p>No change from previous report.</p> <p>No change from previous report</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------	---

## 2022 Project Implementation Report

<b>Output 1.1.5</b> Empty Container management strengthened, extending the network of collection centers and recycling facilities	50% of empty containers treated and recycled		80%	No change from previous report.
	12 fully operational, well-equipped and staffed collection centers		100%	No change from previous report.
	Tools for the collection of containers from producers with low access to Collection Centers (mobile chipper)		100%	During 2021, 3 Container Collection Days were held, where in addition to collecting the kilos of containers to be recycled, they generate in their area and surroundings, awareness of the environmentally appropriate handling and destination of the containers. More than 50 producers participated ( <a href="#">Link</a> ), ( <a href="#">Link</a> )
<b>Outcome 1.2:</b> Capacities developed for site remediation				
<b>Output 1.2.1</b> Guidelines for private sector, including specific site remediation proposals	Guidelines for the development of site-specific proposals	1	100%	No change from previous report.
<u>Outcome 2.1</u>				
<b>Output 2.1.1</b> Pesticide regulations reviewed and updated	A proposal to update the legislation and regulation developed  Updating of the existing regulation	1	100%	No change from previous report.
<b>Output 2.1.2</b> Current registration and authorization system assessed, gaps and capacity building needs	Proposal submitted for registration	1	100%	As an advance to what has already been reported, after many negotiations, the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP) and the Ministry of Environment agreed

## 2022 Project Implementation Report

identified and measures implemented				to improve the proposal for the National Registry of Pesticides seeking to advance in the inclusion of the Environmental Risk Assessment in the Registry of Pesticides. <a href="#">(Link)</a>
<b>Output 2.1.3</b> ERA models included in the training of institutions	At least 10 operators and technicians from DINAMA and MGAP trained in ERA.  General ERA training plan designed.  6 operators and technicians from different laboratories that work in pesticides trained in the value and application of ERA as support for residue analysis.		0%  0%  0%	This activity depends on output 2.1.2 because the new registration proposal will include an Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA) model.  No change from previous report.  No change from previous report.
<b>Output 2.1.4</b> Adoption of the Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA) tool to support the registration of pesticides	ERA included in the registry proposal for improvement  Ecotoxicity parameters from ERA models added to pesticide registration.	1  1	100%  100%	No change from previous report  No change from previous report
<b>Output 2.1.5</b> ERA performed to assess at least three highly used active ingredients	ERA used for the evaluation of at least three highly used active ingredients.	1	0%	No change from previous report. This activity depends on the previous one.
<b><u>Outcome 3.1</u></b>				
<b>Output 3.1.1</b> IPM strategies and other alternatives for priority crops	Strategies developed and validated		100%	No change from previous report  In October 2021, the "IV National Symposium on Agriculture" was held. This is the most important

developed and field tested				biannual event in the country at a technical level. In this framework, one of the main blocks of the event was dedicated to Service Crops. All the information exposed there was generated within the framework of the project together with the Faculty of Agronomy ( <a href="#">Link</a> )
<b>Output 3.1.2</b> Two alternatives to highly toxic pesticides identified, evaluated, tested, including IPM and ICM	Studies completed to identify alternatives to major pesticides  Number of demonstration areas applying alternatives to highly toxic pesticides		100%  100%	In order to continue supporting the dissemination and management adjustments in the use of Rolling, in 2021 it was manufactured a Rolling Pin (3.5 meters of working width) based on the successful experiences generated by both by the Academy and by local producers, so that it can be used in research, as well as dissemination of the tool. ( <a href="#">Link</a> )  During 2021, the manufactured Roller was used to carry out field demonstrations for producers and technicians and was used by some producers who implemented the practice for the first time in their fields ( <a href="#">Link</a> )
<b>Output 3.1.3</b> Training in practices of IPM and application of alternatives to toxic pesticides delivered to agriculture	1,200 producers and workers trained		100%	No change from previous report e.g. ( <a href="#">Link</a> ); ( <a href="#">Link</a> );

workers, and farmers/producers				
<b>Outcome 3.2</b>				
<b>Output 3.2.1</b> A communication strategy developed and implemented to raise awareness on the effects of pesticides on human health and the environment and support dissemination of good practices	Communication strategy created		100%	The work continued on disseminating the tools developed throughout the project. E.g: ( <a href="#">Link</a> ), ( <a href="#">Link</a> ), ( <a href="#">Link</a> ), ( <a href="#">Link</a> ); ( <a href="#">Link</a> – see 1:27:50 minute)
	Publication and video developed		100%	Diffusion; Radio and TV notes, in relevant local and national media. ( <a href="#">Link</a> ), ( <a href="#">Link</a> ), ( <a href="#">Link</a> ), ( <a href="#">Link</a> ), ( <a href="#">Link</a> ); ( <a href="#">Link</a> ; <a href="#">Link2</a> ); ( <a href="#">Link</a> ); ( <a href="#">Link</a> ); ( <a href="#">Link</a> ; <a href="#">Link2</a> )
	Training module developed		100%	Along the project <b>980 people</b> were participated in Training module developed.  Based on the observations made by the Final Evaluators and with the aim of not reporting the same information in two different products, the previously reported activities were divided between product 3.1.3 and 3.2.1.  It should be noted that although the change was agreed, this criterion is not shared by the PCU or by the project counterparts, because all the activities carried out contribute incrementally to the achievement of both outcomes, since the training is

				also considered an instance of awareness and dissemination.
<b>Outcome 4.1</b>				
<b>Output 4.1.1</b> A coordination mechanism for environmental monitoring and response to pesticide risks established	Inter-institutional agreement between MGAP, DINAMA, LATU, UdelaR and departmental authorities		100%	No change from previous report
	Pesticides monitoring plans prepared, implemented and monitored		60%	The second pesticide monitoring program of a priority basin is being executing in the San Salvador basin (Soriano).
<b>Output 4.1.2</b> Harmonized technical and analytical requirements for monitoring pesticide contaminants in environmental matrices (soil, water, sediments and biota) defined	Trained laboratory staff		100%	No change from previous report
	Laboratories in DINAMA and DGSA working in an effective and coordinated way		100%	No change from previous report
	Harmonized analytical requirements		100%	No change from previous report
<b>Output 4.1.3</b> Detailed action protocol for responding to contamination risks and events developed	Systems and protocols for receiving complaints, including citizen control.	1	100%	No change from previous report
	New action plan	1	0%	No change from previous report  Despite having previously held meetings with the Complaints area of the Ministry of the Environment to identify strengths and weaknesses, and evaluate what steps to follow to adjust the Protocol of the Complaints Reception System; This issue has not had a return from the

				ministry, for which it is understood that the product is no longer achievable.
<b>Output 4.1.4</b> Strengthened institutional capacity for environmental monitoring of pesticides	Operators and technicians from DINAMA, MGAP, & Departmental Governments are trained for environmental monitoring of pesticides	40	100%	No change from previous report
<b>Output 4.1.5</b> Sites in at least 3 watersheds selected for monitoring and analysis of pesticide contamination	Pesticide contamination levels measured as part of the environmental plan in 3 river basins		60%	The second pesticide monitoring program is executing now in San Salvador (Soriano).  Up to now, the Product 1 of this agreement was finished. The teams are working in the Product 2 (on time)
<b>Output 4.1.6</b> Measures to minimize pesticide contamination in watersheds identified and implemented	Updated guides for producers to incorporate pesticide use and management		0%	No change from previous report.  Due to the lack of definition of counterparts on this topic, and based on direct consultation, it is determined that this product will not be achieved in the remaining time of the Project.



## 4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

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

This year, despite the COVID-19 pandemic, the project has reinvented itself in several aspects to achieve progress.

**In component 1**, with the approval of the EMP, the MA approved the conditioning of a warehouse that will store obsolete waste until its effective disposal and thus starts the operation with the support that the project will give through the proposal of an LOA with CL. At the same time, a private company manages a request for authorization to enable an oven to eliminate obsolete pesticides in the country.

This important milestone has been highlighted by the MA, allowing Uruguay to eliminate locally, reducing costs and external dependence.

**In component 2**, on the proposal to improve the Pesticide Register, the new ministers were open to dialogue and understood the need to assess the proposals to update the Pesticide Register. To this end, the MA and MGAP ministers agreed to include an Environment Risk Evaluation based on the project proposal.

**In component 3**, all the evaluations of strategy of reduction and/ or substitution of pesticides were completed. Currently the project is focused on disseminating the results to the different institutions, workers and farmers.

**In component 4**, The second pesticide monitoring program of a priority basin, is being executing in San Salvador (Soriano).

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

The biggest challenge was maintaining project activities in the midst of a global pandemic, In addition to this, the authorities were very dedicated to combating the pandemic, which is why many actions and definitions necessary to advance in the last section of the project were slowed down.

This caused that a new extension had to be requested until December 2022 to be able to close some specific issues, but very important for the project, such as the approval of the conditions for storing, conditioning and the oven to eliminating obsolete pesticides associated to the EMP.

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

	<b>FY2022 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2022 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>17</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	<p>As reflected in the progress of the products mentioned above, the project took important steps, achieving significant results in technical and institutional terms, in a context of complex execution by the actors and the subject matter involved.</p> <p>In 2020 and 2021 the COVID-19 Pandemic has greatly distorted the functioning of the institutions, slowing down the possibility of moving forward smoothly. With this scenario, the challenge in this final stage is to achieve specific products in relation with the disposal an elimination obsoletes through the EMP and the Monitory of a 2<sup>nd</sup> priority basin.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The agreement between FAO and “CampoLimpio” (CL) to finance the management of some obsolete stocks with the funds provided was signed. This is an important impulse to beginning the implementation of the EMP. Despite that, achieving this, depends on the Environment Ministry authorizations and the CL work.</li> <li>• Now a days, the Monitoring of a 2nd priority basin, is executing. This is financed by funds from the national counterpart (UTF Project). It is a commitment that was assumed by the Government of Uruguay within the framework of this Project.</li> </ul> <p>The PCU has been working to ensure the continuity of all the lines worked and not to lose the achievements, hoping that the Ministries themselves take ownership to a greater extent and advance in integrating the proposals generated into their public policies, for example: the Biomarkers and Surveillance Program, and the improvement in the Registry.</p>

<sup>15</sup> **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.

<sup>16</sup> **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.

<sup>17</sup> Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

			<p>As a result of the achievements obtained, Uruguay has been invited to be part in the FARM Program: <i>"Strengthening investment for adoption of alternatives and sustainable management of agrochemicals and agriplastics in Africa and Latin America through pilots in Kenya and Uruguay"</i> which recognize, trust and seriousness with which the progress made in this project was taken.</p> <p>Another point that shows the positive impact is about the agreement between the three ministries involved in the Project to work on the new project to consolidate the progress made and are currently working in the PPG stage together.</p>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>S</b>	<p>As reflected in the progress of the products mentioned above, the project took important steps, achieving significant results in technical and institutional terms, in a context of complex execution by the actors and the subject matter involved.</p> <p>As a result of the achievements obtained, Uruguay has been invited to be part in the FARM Program: <i>"Strengthening investment for adoption of alternatives and sustainable management of agrochemicals and agriplastics in Africa and Latin America through pilots in Kenya and Uruguay"</i> which recognize, trust and seriousness with which the progress made in this project was taken.</p>
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>18</sup></b>	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	<p>During 2020 in spite of the pandemics the project kept on the arrangements for UTF funds and leveraging the adoption of the agronomic practices developed along the project, this is a transitional effort in agriculture by acting on the source under a sustainable agriculture approach.</p> <p>Additionally the monitoring of the San Salvador basin was planned and started. This transforms the actual capacity monitoring in river basin as compared to the previous in a highly intensive effort which broadens the matrices covered and leverages a more integral pesticides impact assessment.</p> <p>The analytical capacities kept growing to include the foreseen pesticides and as part of the San Salvador basin monitoring efforts will develop pesticide analysis in fish.</p> <p>Regarding the stock elimination, Campo Limpio proposed the elimination in a local incineration facility of the tones covered in the LoA. This is under consideration of the</p>

<sup>18</sup> In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

			<p>Minister. This would mean the start for the operations of the Obsolete Elimination scheme.</p> <p>Considering the project's approach the country was included as LATAM pilot country for the FARM programme so as to keep on working on pesticides and agriplastics.</p>
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>S</b>	<p>Although the project implementation has generally witnessed substantial delays, it has achieved significant and positive results. Considering the efforts made so far, it is expected that the remaining activities shall be realised before the closure of the project. Great achievement is strong cooperation between the three ministries involved in the Project and their agreement to continue further joint cooperation in chemicals projects.</p>
<b>FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>S</b>	<p>The report on the progress at the output level is satisfactory, but the achievement of some outcomes is still a challenge. The project has taken action during the reporting period to move forward on outcomes related to the institutionalization of project results by government institutions, such as those related with the handling and elimination at the national level of obsolete pesticides, that must also be included into national legislation and tools. During the final period of implementation, the cooperation and appropriation of the ministries involved will be fundamental for the long-term sustainability of the project results.</p>

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

## 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

*Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)*

Please describe the progress made complying with the approved ESM plan. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Add new ESS risks if any risks have emerged during this FY.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
<b>ESS 1: Natural Resource Management</b>				
<b>ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats</b>				
<b>ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
<b>ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture</b>				
<b>ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management</b>				
<b>ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement</b>				
<b>ESS 7: Decent Work</b>				
<b>ESS 8: Gender Equality</b>				
<b>ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage</b>				
<b>New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY</b>				

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

Initial ESS Risk classification (At project submission)	Current ESS risk classification Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid <sup>20</sup> . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Category (B)/ Moderate	Still valid

***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.***

<sup>20</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

## 6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Delays in the adoption of updated norms and procedures, and lack of inter-institutional coordination.	Low	Y	The mitigation strategy has had results. 4 of 5 proposals of the life cycle stages that emerged from the working groups have been presented. Although they have not yet been approved, it is considered an achievement to have presented them, due to this point depend of the national authorities and not for the project.	This risk does not present changes	

---

<sup>21</sup> Risk ratings means a rating of accesses 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 <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
2	Limited collaboration of the private sector and the producers to support the project, in particular shipping containers to collection centers, and identification of stocks of obsolete pesticides and any eventual contaminated sites.	Low	Y	Complementing the activities developed during the execution of the project, significant efforts were made to transfer the tools and evidence obtained by the project to improve the management of pesticides and thus increase the adherence to these Good Agricultural Practices by the producers. The commercial sector actively participated in the generation of regulatory proposals and expressed its support for the improvement objectives for the Pesticide Registry.	This risk does not present changes	
3	The budget available is not enough for the environmentally sound disposal of identified stockpiles of obsolete pesticides.	Low	Y	According to current regulations, importers and formulators of pesticides will be responsible for the disposal of obsolete stocks. So, the private sector is responsible for the proper storage of pesticides and covering its elimination through the obsolete management plan (Decree 152/013).	This risk does not present changes	



	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
4	Low level of commitment of the authorities (National Directors), as well as the members of the meeting groups of each component	Low	Y	As a mitigation strategy, the PCU regularly proposed to the Project Steering Committee the lines of work to be developed for each year, in order to obtain formal responses (validation), avoiding delays and also allowing them to decide in which activities they want to participate in the project and in which ones not.	This risk does not present changes.	
5	Resistance in the integration of improvements in the registry and evaluation ERA by authorities.	Low		<p>Although the strategy originally proposed achieved some results, the risks are still present given the political burden of this output. The decision regarding the implementation or not, of the proposed improvements for the ERA and Registration passes through political decisions, which are beyond the scope of the project.</p> <p>For this reason, it is proposed to adapt the strategy and accept the risk considering the output to be not as the implementation but as the proposals presented to the authorities.</p>	This risk does not present changes.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Not being able to meet the target of eliminating 160 tons of obsoletes pesticides during the execution of the project.	Substantial	N	The PCU communicates to the authority that although the EMP was approved, there is still the approval of the authorization to eliminate at local level through an authorization of a special oven.	<p>The LoA with CL to move forward in the beginning of the executing the EMP was signed. This is executing now a days.</p> <p>This agreement will allow the first obsolete disposal experience to be carried out through the approved plan.</p>	

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

FY2021 rating	FY2022 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	M	<p>As has been mentioned throughout the report, given the global situation due to COVID-19, the project has had to adapt to new realities. This scenario generated new delays and slowdowns in the execution of some of the project outputs, which are generally directly associated with the lack of definition by the authorities on some of the key outputs, which ends influencing the achievement of outcomes.</p> <p>The challenges, which in some way have been repeated throughout the project, have been partly overcome by the strategies implemented.</p> <p>In any of the circumstances, the project still continues the hard work in communicate these points to the authorities in all formal opportunities, seeking and working together in proposal different options to moving forward with pending resolutions.</p>

**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.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented <u>during this Fiscal Year</u>
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

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

## 8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have 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 Guidelines<sup>22</sup>. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories. And, provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	NTE extended until 31 December 2022		
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other			

<sup>22</sup> Source: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>

## 9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<b>Government Institutions</b>			
<b>National Directorate of Environment (DINACEA) – MA</b>	Leading national partner. Coordinate project implementation and project management along with the GEF Agency (FAO).	<p>Ensured the close collaboration with other ministries and participating entities.</p> <p>Led the project and was an essential part of its achievements.</p> <p>Also a work plan was executed with its laboratory and it was incorporated more than 100 new assets in water samples, as well as validation and adjustments of analytical methodologies with multiple pesticide residues (participates in all outcomes).</p>	
<b>General Directorate of Agricultural Services (DGSA) – MGAP</b>	Support project implementation and co-leading in the project steering committee	<p>In close collaboration with DINACEA, FAO and other ministries and participating entities, it was part of the activities of the project.</p> <p>As achievements of the three ministries, the updating, search and improvement of the registration in the theme of the environment was given. This was a challenge for the authorities to accept and continue that line to concretely implement the proposed changes.</p>	
<b>Ministry of Public Health (MSP)</b>	Support project implementation and co-leading in the project steering committee	<p>In close collaboration with DINACEA, FAO and other ministries and participating entities, it was part of the activities of the project.</p> <p>As achievements of the three ministries, the updating, search and improvement of the registration in the theme of the environment was given. This was a challenge for the authorities to accept and continue that line to concretely implement the proposed changes.</p>	
<b>Other MGAP's agencies and projects (General Directorate of Horticulture - DIGEGRA, National Institute</b>	Participate in project implementation	They were participated in project implementation by providing inputs and experiences on the adaptation and adoption of technologies related to the	

of Agricultural Research - INIA)		rational use of pesticides at general and sector level (participates in 2.1 and 3.1).	
<b>Non-Government organizations (NGOs)</b>			
Latin American Network for Action against Pesticides (RAPAL),	Civil society organizations aimed at promoting viable alternatives for the development of socially just, ecologically sustainable and economically viable agriculture.	They participated in project implementation with specific contributions to the role of civil society in the use and sound management of pesticides (participates in 3.1). In the last period of time they had passive participation in the reception and dissemination of the results of the project.	
Network of Environmental NGOs (CEUTA, Net of Agroecology)			
<b>Private sector entities</b>			
Commerce Chamber of Agrochemical Products (CAMAGRO, CANAFFI, civil association "CampoLimpio" and Others recycling companies)	They represented the companies involved in the manufacture, formulation, import or trade of phytosanitary products. Establish relations with public and private organizations, at national or international level, which promote the responsible and effective use of agrochemicals.	They participated in all the working groups and were active players in matters related to the Pesticide Registry.  CampoLimpio is a key actor with which progress was made in Empty Container management Plan and the EMP	
Private Companies: AUSID and Oilseeds Technological Bureau, Rural communities: producers and their organizations, SOFOVAL, FADISOL, Barraca ERRO, and others private companies	They supported the implementation of the project activities related to IPM (Participates in the trainings 3.1 and 3.2).	They were clue actors in the field, working with the farmers. They organized a lot of activities with the project for technicians, producers and operators.	
<b>Others[1]</b>			
University of the Republic (UdelaR) –School of Chemistry, School of Sciences, School of Engineering, School of Agronomy, Eastern Regional Centers (CURE), School of Medicine (CIAT)	Participate in project implementation with specific contributions to the role of academy	They participated in 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1. The proposed new lines of work were continued by the institutions that will continue once the project ends.  They were clue actors in the validation and development of strategies with scientific support.	
Producers and technicians in the area of influence of demonstration sites	The urban population associated with the area and local social organizations are direct beneficiaries of the project actions, either through targeted training or dissemination of activities.	In every field action (despite the constraints), we have received a very positive feedback indicating that these have a positive impact on the target audience (participates in 2.1 and 3.1). It is a challenge for the project that producers continue to adhere to the practices and lines of work started by the project.	

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

## 10. Gender Mainstreaming

**Information on Progress on Gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable) during this reporting period.**

As previously reported, although gender mainstreaming was not included in the Project Document, the project sought to improve in this regard.

The exchanges carried out with the MGAP gender consultancy, generated a document that despite not being able to be implemented by the end of the project (as well as the pandemic that has not allowed training with rural women), intends to leave some main lines of work in the subject to include in future projects.

## 11. Knowledge Management Activities

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

The pandemic severely limited all field activities in the territory. However, the project continued to implement some strategies that made its results visible, although taking into account that the scope would be limited, among them are:

- Day of recycling of containers; carried out in October 2021 in Canelones. More than 50 farmers participated. ([Link](#))
- Cover crops and roller As a method of mechanical control. In order to continue supporting the dissemination and management adjustments in the use of Rolling as a technique to dry cover crops. In 2021 it was manufactured a Rolling Pin (3.5 meters of working width) based on the successful experiences generated by both by the Academy and by local producers, so that it can be used in research, as well as dissemination of the tool.  
The Roller was used to carry out field demonstrations for producers and technicians and was used by some producers who implemented the practice for the first time in their fields. ([Link](#))
- Biobeds; as a continuation of the impulse that was given to the tool through the evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness that the project carried out together with the General Directorate of the Farm (DIGEGRA) and its dissemination, DIGEGRA has integrated into another project (eg. INIA and FUCREA) the possibility of financing other experiences in other areas and on a larger scale, such as the experience of assembling a Biological Bed in two wine-growing estates (one of them a reference in its area). This summation of success stories, added to the dissemination and appropriation and impulse from DIGEGRA, is a highly positive fact for the increase in adherence by producers, thinking about sustainability and scalability towards the future post-project. The project participated in field activities organized by INIA and FUCREA, relating the experience in the construction and use of Biological Beds in the country. ([Link](#)), ([Link](#)); ([Link](#))
- Another form of effective communication developed by the project to keep contact with the public, are the newsletters that every three months the project generates with the intention of showing progress. So far it has had very good reception.
- The project has worked in previous years on raising risk awareness in pesticide management through the course of training on “Prevention and action before Incidents /accidents in pesticide manipulation in agriculture”. The objective is to provide tools of prevention and action to face different situations that might occur when working with pesticides, which arise from the Guide developed by the Project. ([Link](#)) In 2021, a re-edition and re-printing of the Guide was carried out in order to be used in the trainings of the ministries. The Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries Ministry is currently using this Guide in all courses for workers which manage pesticides and apply them in the field. Annually these courses reach 500 workers and agricultural fumigation companies.



## 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.**

There are no indigenous people involved in the project.

### 13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>23</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2022	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Agency	FAO	In-kind	300,000	375,500	102,000	389,500
Local Government	MA	In-kind and grant	2,008,000	3,114,000	800,000	3,254,400
Local Government	MGAP	In-kind	1,080,000	1,547,000	490,000	1,592,000
Civil Society Organization	Campo Limpio	In-kind	2,620,000	4,320,000	890,000	4,720,000
Local Government	OSE	In-kind	1,250,000	0	0	0
Local Government	MSP	In-kind	0	100,700	29,000	102,000
		<b>TOTAL</b>	7,258,000	9,457,200	2,311,000	10,057,950

<sup>23</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

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

It should be noted that co-financing was over-fulfilled.

The Ministry of the Environment, through Project UTF/URU/035/URU, which originally planned to contribute USD 400,000, was increased to USD 1,069,544 to support project activities. In particular, the Pesticide Monitoring Plan in priority basins and the dissemination of Good Agricultural Practices.

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

<b>Development Objectives Rating.</b> A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve or exceed <b>all</b> its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve <b>most</b> of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve <b>some</b> of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only <b>some</b> of its major global environmental objectives)
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Project is expected <b>not</b> to achieve <b>most</b> of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits)
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, <b>any</b> of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

<b>Implementation Progress Rating.</b> 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.	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	Implementation of <b>all</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	Implementation of <b>most</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Implementation of <b>some</b> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Implementation of <b>some</b> components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Implementation of <b>most</b> components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

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