



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

### 2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



## 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>	615540
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	5144
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and Environment (MVOTMA)
<b>Project Duration:</b>	MSP
	42 months

### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	N/A
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	9 March, 2015
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	4 January, 2016
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	1 January, 2019
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	1 July, 2020
	N/A

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	1,874,028
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	7,258,000
<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	1,406,368

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

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

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

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

<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	5,254,200
--	-----------

### Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	7 December, 2018
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	February 2018
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	June 2018
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	March 2020
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>No</b>

### Ratings

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

### Status

<b>Implementation Status (1<sup>st</sup> PIR, 2<sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

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

<sup>6</sup> 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
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Sebastián Viroga, National Project Coordinator.	sebastian.viroga@mvtma.gub.uy
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Elisabetta Tagliati, Project Coordinator Pest and Pesticide Management – AGPM.	elisabetta.tagliati@fao.org
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Jorge Meza, Representation of the FAO in Uruguay - XTL5. Vicente Plata, Operation support in Uruguay – FAOUY.	vicente.plata@fao.org
<b>CBC-GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Climate and Environment Division, CBC</b>	Valeria Gonzalez Riggio, Natural Resources Officer, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit.	valeria.gonzalezriggio@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s):</b>						
<b>Component 1</b>	<b>Reduction of stocks and elimination of obsolete pesticides and containers.</b>					
<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>Obsolete pesticides, including POPs pesticides, disposed of in an environmentally sound manner.</p> <p>Waste management plans to prevent further accumulation of pesticide stockpiles and empty pesticide containers.</p> <p>Management Plans budgeted and implemented.</p>	<p>0 Tons.</p> <p>Management plans have been developed.</p>		<p>160 Tons.</p> <p>Management Plans budgeted and implemented.</p>	<p>0%</p> <p>The elimination depends on the approval of DINAMA for initial operations. However, once the Waste Management Plan is approved, the tons are expected to remain in the port until they are exported. This is expected to occur before the end of the project.</p> <p>80%</p> <p>The Environmental Management Plan was approved technically (March 2019); there is a draft resolution proposal from DINAMA. Requiring only the signature in the resolution</p>	<b>Marginally Satisfactory (MS)</b>

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

<sup>8</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>9</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					plan to start the operations.	
<b>Outcome 1.2:</b> Capacities developed for site remediation.	Enhanced capacities of private sector organizations.	No capacity building programme in place		Enhanced capacities of private sector organizations.	90% The development of the guide and its graphic design finished. Currently with DINAMA communication team, details are being adjusted based on the suggestions made by the counterparts in order to publish them.  The Terms of Reference are already prepared to hire the consultant who will perform a training plan for different audience during the second semester (2019).	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>
<b>Component 2</b>	<b>Strengthening the legal framework and institutional capacity for the rational and integral management of pesticides throughout their lifecycle.</b>					
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Legislative and regulatory framework for the environmentally sound management of POPs and pesticides is improved.	Pesticides or POPs pesticides regulations in place.  Regulation is enforced with corresponding Budget	Pesticides or POPs pesticides regulations in place.  Regulation adopted but is not enforced		Pesticides or POPs pesticides regulations in place.  Regulation is enforced with corresponding Budget	80% Proposals for improvement of regulations were developed and delivered for 4 of the 5 stages of the pesticide's life cycle; Use / Application, Storage, Transportation, Import (improvement proposal for the registration of pesticides).	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>The Mid-term Review highlighted that the project coordinating unit (PCU) is responsible for the delivery of technical inputs and normative proposals, but the normative approval and implementation escapes the scope of the project, depending strictly on political decisions of each ministry.</p> <p>To collaborate in that line, the International Consultant Registry Consultant was contracted for second time with the target of advancing in a second stage.</p> <p>The International Registry Consultant generated a proposal to modify the Registry of Pesticides of Uruguay and currently he is developing the requirements necessary for its implementation.</p> <p>As additional activities that contribute to the outcome, proposals (not initially planned) were elaborated, two studies for the search</p>	

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					and incorporation (to the regulations) of new biomarkers of exposure to pesticides, and the development of a project for vigilance of workers exposed to agricultural pesticides.	
<b>Component 3</b>	Promoting Integrated Pest Management (IPM), pesticide sound use and management, and other alternative to hazardous pesticides, through demonstration units.					
<b>Outcome 3.1</b> The use of toxic pesticides reduced through the adoption of IPM and other alternatives.	200 tons of reduced toxic pesticides			200 tons of reduced toxic pesticides	90% This indicator will be measured at the end of the project because of the strategies proposed for its execution. There are substantial advances that result from the achievement of the outputs. Different management strategies have been evaluated to reduce the use of pesticides and reduce the environmental and health impact of the production. Based on these results, training and dissemination are being developed to promote these tools.  Training events in field days and theoretical exposition	<b>Satisfactory (S).</b>

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>were held in the country. Until the date of this review 1218 people have been trained in promoting good agricultural practices that encourage (among other things) the reduction in the use of pesticides.</p> <p>However, the project does not have the tools to ensure the reduction of pesticides, nor the adherence of the producers over time. This was highlighted by the Mid-term Review: "...the project does not have the tools to ensure agreement with this result. The national experience provides indications that the adoption of Good Agricultural Practices, including Integrated Pest Management, is necessary to accompany economic incentives, which the project lacks.</p>	
<b>Outcome 3.2</b> Increased awareness on the effects of conventional pesticides and on	Medium-level (as assessed by DINAMA)	Low level awareness (as assessed by DINAMA)		Increased awareness as perceived by officials and producers	87% The indicator of this outcome will be measured at the end of the project based on the progress of	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
alternatives available.					the results. This emerges from a new target that includes material of publication and videos about the field days, as well as the strategies and alternatives proposed in the demonstration sites. During the second semester of this year, other new material will be generated focused on the dissemination and awareness of the risks associated with the use of pesticides searching their adhesion.	
<b>Component 4</b>	<b>Strengthening environmental monitoring and response to risks from hazardous pesticide</b>					
<b>Outcome 4.1</b> Enhanced capacity for monitoring and timely response to pesticide risks to human health and the environment.	Medium-level of capacities (as measured by DINAMA and MSP)	Medium-low level of capacities (as measured by DINAMA and MSP)		Medium-level of capacities (as measured by DINAMA and MSP)	50% The indicator of this outcome will be measured at the end of the project based on the progress of the results. The work plan continues to advance with the DINAMA and DGSA Laboratories. The international Laboratory Consultant was hired in December 2018 to provide assistance to the member laboratories of the Network of Environmental Laboratories of Uruguay	<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>(RLAU) and other relevant actors at the national level, in the accreditation for pesticide analysis in environmental, biological and food matrices. The Pesticide Monitoring Program in Laguna del Cisne (Canelones) ended.</p> <p>Currently, a Letter of Agreement (LOA) is undergoing based on the lessons learned in the first pesticide monitoring in Laguna del Cisne, with the intention to implement in a second basin called San Salvador (Soriano) during the second semester (2019).</p>	

**Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating <sup>10</sup>**

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>The Environmental Management Plan was technically approved (March, 2019); there is a draft resolution proposal from DINAMA. Requiring only the signature in the resolution plan to start the operations.</p>	<p>By Ministry of Housing Land Planning and Environment (MVOTMA) Division: National Directorate of Environment (DINAMA).</p>	<p>From January, 2019</p>

---

<sup>10</sup> To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>11</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>12</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>13</sup>			Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR (final)		
<b>Output 1.1.1</b> MGAP and DINAMA trainers trained in inventory planning, safeguard and storage of hazardous waste. And environmental assessment of contaminated sites	Q4 Y2	FAO consultant has been identified, the proposal advanced and dates are being coordinated.	A proposal for training (EMTK) was presented but FAO consultant retired, so it returned to the initial state in the search of the consultant and mission coordination.	The recommendation of the Mid-term Review (MTR) was accepted. This means a change in the implementation strategy in the component, this output was eliminated and its target will be transferred to output 1.1.2.	-%	Based on the recommendation of the MTR, the output target of 10 trained trainers was transferred to output 1.1.2.
<b>Output 1.1.2</b> Staff of DINAMA, MGAP, FAGRO and local governments are trained in obsolete pesticides and	Q4 Y4	A proposal was prepared including specific criteria to be taken into account in the planning	A proposal was prepared including specific criteria to be taken into account in the planning trainings.	As mentioned above, this output target is linked with the previous output (1.1.1).	0%	This output was unified with the previous one, going from the original target of 70 people to 80 people. This training is planned to be conducted the second semester of this year.

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

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

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

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

contaminated sites		trainings.				
<b>Output 1.1.3</b> Completed inventory of stocks of obsolete pesticides, including POPs.	Q2 Y2	Annual inventory completed. The consultant delivered three of the three products provided to the counterparts.	Annual inventory completed. The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) was completed. Campo Limpio presented it to DINAMA for approval.	The updated inventory was completed. The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) was technically approved by the DINAMA, still missing the signature of the resolution with the objective of setting deadlines that allow starting the elimination operations.	33%	The first survey of obsolete stock was made, and it will be updated once the resolution that allows starting the execution of the Environmental Management Plan is signed.
	Q2Y2				100%	The output "EMP proposed to the private sector" is added on the recommendation of the MTR, as it is a "key" element for achieving this result.
<b>Output 1.1.4</b> Strengthened capacity of the private sector for the elimination of obsolete pesticides, including POPs and empty containers	Q2 Y5	n/a (or done)	n/a (or done)	The elimination of obsoletes has not yet been achieved, however, once the resolution is approved by DINAMA, actions will be taken to eliminate all identified stocks.	0%	Once the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) is technically approved, the private institution through Campo Limpio will have the obligation to comply the EMP by the decree 152/13, establishing deadlines for export the stocks surveyed by the obsolete pesticide survey (output 1.1.3).
	Q3 Y2	n/a (or done)	n/a (or done)	On the recommendation of the MTR, the target of this output will be adjusted in order to train 80 people, instead of the 120 initially proposed. These activities will be carried out once the Environmental	0%	It is highlighted today that the management of obsolete stocks is regulated by Decree 152/013 being the responsibility of the import / formulator / manufacturer sector. In this way, the elimination will be carried out but it is not certain that it will be within the term of the project.

				Management Plan is approved.		The implementation was rescheduled for the second semester of this year of the project; this activity will be done after approving the EMP.
<b>Output 1.1.5</b> Empty Container management strengthened, extending the network of collection centers and recycling facilities	Q2 Y4	The container management has been strengthened in several aspects.	The container management continues to be strengthened in several aspects and a mobile harvesting and shredding system is developed and planned for areas with poor coverage.	On the recommendation of the MTR, an output not originally foreseen will be added in line with the Strengthening of the Packaging Management System- <i>Tools for collection of containers for producers with low access to Collection Centers</i> - with the aim of the strengthening the Collection Centers	108%	At the date of the report there is 13 collection center functioning exceeding the proposed objective (12).
	Q4 Y3			In order to carry out this output, "Harvesting Days" (together with other actors) were implemented as an alternative of collection for producers with low access (in general, by distance) to the Collection Centers. This initiative is added to the mobile	80%	The organization Campo Limpio (CL) reported to December 2018 an increase of 25% in the tons of containers collected. Representing according to CL 40% of the total commercialized.
	Q4 Y3					100%

				shredding system already reported previously.		
<b>Output 1.2.1</b> Guidelines for private sector, including specific site remediation proposals	Q4 Y4	n/a (or done) The terms of reference (TOR) were made to call a consultancy; they still need to be validated.	Two consultants were hired to develop the content of the guidelines of prevention and remediation to incidents / accidents to field activities with pesticides; as well as a graphic designer.	The development of the Guide of prevention and action before incidents / accidents in the manipulation of pesticides (contents and graphic design) is being finalized. Currently, some adjustments are being made prior to their publication based on the contributions of the counterparts.	90%	With the guidelines completed, the communication team of DINAMA is working to adjust the contributions made by the counterparts.  The publication (digital and on paper) is included in the training plan for the second semester of this year.
<b>Output 2.1.1</b> Pesticide regulations reviewed and updated	Q4 Y4	The Working Group generated specific lines of action to proposals in the stage of use and application of pesticides in the life cycle. The stage of transport and storage was started.	A Technical document is being adjusted with the Working Group for the proposed regulation of environmentally adequate storage of pesticides.	Proposals for improvement of regulations were developed and delivered for 4 of the 5 stages of the life cycle of the pesticides; " <u>Use / Application</u> " on the control of the state of the fumigation equipment. A proposal for the environmentally adequate regulation of pesticides was prepared with the	80%	A proposal to control the state of maintenance of fumigation equipment was sent to DGSA (without response until today).  The technical proposal for the regulation of environmentally adequate storage and transport of pesticides was concluded. This document was developed with the Working Group and is currently in Legal Division of DINAMA for the drafting of the legislation and regulation.  As additional activities that contribute to the outcome, proposals were elaborated of two

				<p>Working Group on "<u>Storage</u>" and "<u>Transport</u>" (currently it is in DINAMA's Law to elaborate the standard). The stage of "<u>Importation</u>" the international consultant presented a proposal to modify regulations for the National Pesticide Registry.</p> <p>The "<u>Elimination</u>" stage, together with the approval of the Environmental Management Plan, is analyzed to include some adjustments to the current regulations, to strengthen some weak points that the country's system presents today.</p>		<p>studies for the search and incorporation (to the regulations) of new biomarkers of exposure to pesticides, and the development of a project for surveillance of workers exposed to agricultural pesticides.</p>
<p><b>Output 2.1.2</b> Current registration and authorization system assessed, gaps and capacity building needs identified and measures implemented</p>	Q2 Y4	<p>The terms of reference (TORs) were made and two potential international consultants were identified.</p>	<p>Through an International Consultancy, a proposal to improve the ERA and Pesticide Registration was developed. These documents were validated by the technicians of DINAMA and DGSA</p>	<p>The first consultancy of the International Registry Consultant was finalized presenting an improvement proposal for the Registry (which includes a proposal for the Environmental Risk Assessment) and a proposal to modify</p>	100%	<p>In the second contract, the International Registry Consultant presented a proposal for registry regulations, which will be submitted to the authorities for consideration. On the other hand, the Consultant continues to work on the development of the methodologies and requirements of the "new" Registry.</p> <p>Based on the recommendation of</p>

			in April 2018.	the regulations on the registration of pesticides. Through a second consultancy a proposal of decree regulations will be presented for the modification of the Registry, which will be put to the consideration of the authorities.		the MTR, the output target ( <i>updating the Registry system</i> ) is beyond the scope of the project, because this depends on a strictly political decision. Hence, it was proposed to limit the scope to "submitted proposal" and no "updated system" (thus taking the proposal as an indicator).
<b>Output 2.1.3</b> ERA models included in the training of institutions	Q2 Y3	n/a (or done) n/a (or done) n/a (or done)	n/a (or done) n/a (or done) n/a (or done)	Execution depends on the political decision made on the proposed amendments to the Registry that includes the ERA.	0% 0% 0%	This activity depends on output 2.1.2 because the new registration proposal will include an Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA) model.
<b>Output 2.1.4</b> Adoption of the Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA) tool to support the registration of pesticides	Q2 Y3	n/a (or done) n/a (or done)	n/a (or done) n/a (or done)	The MTR recommended that ERA was included in the proposed improvement of the Pesticide Registry. The ERA implementation is not within the scope of the project (as already pointed out). The project is considering the proposal submitted by the International Registry Consultant (Product 2 of the first consultancy): to improve ERA in the pesticides registry.	100% 100%	This activity depends on output 2.1.2 and the approval of the environmental risk assessment (ERA) model.  The MTR recommended to change the original output target from "an approved ERA proposal" to "an ERA proposal submitted".

				The achievement of this output is not within the scope of the project since its realization will depend on the decisions made by the authorities regarding the proposal to improve the Registry.		
<b>Output 2.1.5</b> ERA performed to assess at least three highly used active ingredients	Q3 Y3	n/a (or done)	n/a (or done)	This output depends on the approval of the proposed improvement of the Registry that includes the ERA.	0%	This activity depends on the previous one.
<b>Output 2.1.6</b> Improved pesticide information system	Q3 Y3	n/a (or done)	n/a (or done)	As this system already exists in the MGAP (Profit) and the need for improvement is not visualized, the proposal of the MTR to cancel this output was accepted	-%	The MTR recommended to cancel this output.
<b>Output 3.1.1</b> IPM strategies and other alternatives for priority crops developed and field tested	Q4 Y3	The techniques that are currently used and development of pest with different management strategies that help to reduce toxicity, replace pesticides with	Letters of agreement were signed with different institutions to carry out activities and evaluations of different management strategies that help to reduce pesticides in demonstration	Four strategies for reducing and / or replacing pesticides were tested and assessed: 1- Control of soybean pests (Impacts assessment associated with the use of insecticides in the control of pests in the cultivation of soybean) found a	133%	Finalized the field assessments on the strategies proposed to reduce the use of pesticides in the different demonstration sites in the Colonia de Valdense, Soriano and Santa Lucia areas.  It is emphasized that in the case of the strategy of the use of coverage for weed control, work continues through an amendment to the Letter of Agreement (LOA) with FAGRO and a new LOA with

		<p>biological controllers, etc.</p>	<p>site in different areas and priority production system (Colonia Valdense, San Salvador and Santa Lucia basin).</p>	<p>reduction of 12% of pesticides during a first cycle.</p> <p>2- Weed Control (through the School of Agronomy of Uruguay - FAgro) continuing the previous line of work and incorporating tools for the drying of covers such as "Rolled". The results show between 80 and 85% of weed control for the use of cover, and a reduction of the use of pesticides of up to 20% in the crop cycle. This strategy supports the work of another Letter of Agreement with the National Institute of Agricultural Research (INIA) to evaluate the effect of the tools to reduce the use of herbicides.</p> <p>3- Use of biological control agents for pest control in greenhouses replacing pesticides. (FAgro) in support of DIGEGRA.</p>	<p>the National Institute of Agricultural Research (INIA), to collect more information and try new tools that allow its adoption.</p> <p>Through the LOA, training activities and other products (like publications, booklets) have been generated to be used in the dissemination and training planned for the future.</p> <p>During the period of this report, 9 field days distributed with wide coverage were carried out: Paysandú (29/8/18), Salto y Canelones (19/10/18), Colonia Valdense (25/10/18), Ombúes de Lavalle (26/10/18), Dolores (01/11/18), Mercedes (23/11/18), Paysandú (20/12/2018), Colonia (01/09/2019) and Canelones (21/03/ 2019).</p> <p>In the case of Biological Beds, it is important to mention that it is the first time in the country that this real situation has been evaluated in a field, and in laboratory more than 30 active ingredients are being evaluated in the South America region.</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------	---	---	---

				<p>4- The experience on alternative tools to pesticides for the fruit sector (Colonia Valdense) was successfully closed.</p> <p>As additional activities that contribute to the outcome; Biological beds (Bio beds) with FQUIM evaluated at the laboratory and field level in Canelones and Soriano. Also Bio-pesticides/ Bio-fertilizers call was made to support this development in the substitution of pesticides.</p>		
<p><b>Output 3.1.2</b> Two alternatives to highly toxic pesticides identified, evaluated, tested, including IPM and ICM</p>	<p>Q3 Y3</p> <p>Q4 Y3</p>	<p>The identification of non-toxic alternatives was made. In Q4Y2 the non-toxic alternatives will be evaluated and tested in the six selected demonstrative sites.</p>	<p>Alternatives to pesticides were identified; the use of coverages for the control of weeds, biological control agents and bio-insecticides, which are being evaluated in the field (in the demonstration sites).</p>	<p>The LOA to validate three alternatives to pesticides ended. For example: the use of coverages for the control of weeds, the use of biological control agents and the study of the impact of insecticides in the handling of soybeans.</p> <p>To promote more alternatives, the</p>	<p>100%</p> <p>100%</p>	<p>Evaluated alternatives coincide with the proposed management strategies. As reported in the previous point, the MTR recommended to remove this output.</p> <p>The call for bio-pesticides was made in May/June 2019. As of the date of this report, the proposals are being evaluated with the intention of starting the initiative during the second semester.</p>

				project made a call to support and encourage the registration and production of bio-pesticides and bio-fertilizers.		
<b>Output 3.1.3</b> Training in practices of IPM and application of alternatives to toxic pesticides delivered to agriculture workers, and farmers/producers	Q2 Y4	Field activities are being implemented this year, thus the training depends on these. A training in good practices and alternatives to pesticides is being coordinated for Q3Y2 and for other related sites.	A work plan was defined to carry out the training in several areas of the country. This plan seeks to reinforce field activities, based on the results of the Letters of Agreement and other proposals, such as seminars.	The work plan was defined to carry out training in several areas of the country. This plan seeks to reinforce the field activities, based on the results of the Letters of Agreement and other proposals, such as seminars.	102%	Although the target has already been met, the PCU plans to continue in this line of promotion of good agricultural practices and the reduction of pesticide use through the evaluated strategies.
<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	Q4 Y2	A consultant was hired as an input to the communication strategy from socio-economic study that will help to define the communication and dissemination	By different criteria among the partner institutions of the Project, it has not been possible to establish a clear communication strategy. However, different dissemination and training activities have been carried	Very useful materials were generated for the trainings, such as field cards. For the case of the course; "Safe, effective and effective use of phytosanitary products" and "Application technologies for the farmer sector ". The content of the theoretical material	80%	Based on the recommendations of the MTR, a new output target is proposed: "two developed publication or video materials". "Dissemination Activities" are also included, since previously there was no indicator measuring any achievement.  In addition the project continues with communication difficulties because of the sensitivity of the theme and the sensitization that this is at the level of the

		strategy in demonstrative sites. The first report and the output 1 of three were delivered correctly.	out, emphasizing awareness and repercussions on health and the environment.	was also generated with the content used in the training. All these inputs will be used in the successive trainings to be held on the subject.		counterparts, added to the difficulties to find common strategies, the institutions are very cautious when it comes to exposing the issue, and the initiatives are incipient. This has led to not being able to generate a strategy to its full potential (although there are actions that are carried out) As action measures, the PCU has used FAO Communication Division of FAO-UY to disseminate the project and its activities.
<b>Output 4.1.1</b> A coordination mechanism for environmental monitoring and response to pesticide risks established	Q3 Y2	DINAMA signed an agreement with the School of Chemistry of the University of Republic (UdelaR) for the analysis of pesticides. At the same time PCU is working with MGAP to align institutional objectives in search of generate others agreement.	<p>The agreement between DINAMA and School of Chemistry of the University of Republic (UdelaR) was made.</p> <p>The pesticide monitoring program is being developed in Laguna del Cisne (Canelones), in order to define a replicable methodology and logistics to apply to other priority watersheds</p>	<p>The agreement between DINAMA and School of Chemistry of the University of Republic (UdelaR) was made.</p> <p>The monitoring of the first priority basin finished, the results are being evaluated very positively, because they allowed generating work protocols and knowledge about the dynamics of the pesticides in that basin.</p> <p>Based on these results, the proposal for the second basin is</p>	100%	<p>Work is being done to strengthen inter-institutional agreements between all agreed laboratories. It has been made the agreement with the School of Chemistry and DINAMA as support in the analysis and development of techniques for DNAMA.</p> <p>In addition, a SWAT Modeling National Consultant was hired to monitor the project, in support of the monitoring planning carried out by DINAMA.</p>
	Q4 Y3				43%	

			basins in the country.	being developed, which is expected to begin during the second semester of 2019.		
<b>Output 4.1.2</b> Harmonized technical and analytical requirements for monitoring pesticide contaminants in environmental matrices (soil, water, sediments and biota) defined	Q2 Y4	A work plan was developed for the development of capacities with the DINAMA and the DGSA laboratory working in the same line.	The work plans are being carried out with both laboratories (DINAMA and DGSA) with some adjustments.	Work plans continue to be developed with DINAMA and DGSA for the analysis of pesticides to be monitored on a common basis, according to their competency matrixes, coordinating the list of pesticides. In addition to the inputs acquired, the human resources hired by the project to support these developments stand out.	100%	Based on the MTR recommendation, the participation of the Ministry of Public Health (MSP) has been removed from this output, as the MSP does not have any laboratory.
	Q2 Y4			The International Laboratory Consultant, was hired in December 2018 to provide support to the reference laboratories (DINAMA, DGSA) in the accreditation of the ISO / IEC 17025 standard. Within his consultancy a Workshop on Flexible Scope was held for technicians and	100%	Based on the work plans developed and with the support of the International Consultant (hired from December) to achieve the accreditation of ISO / IEC 17025, the working protocols between DINAMA and DGSA will be harmonized, because compliance with This standard ensures a comparable and equal way of working and quality standards in terms of quality assurance of laboratories.
	Q2Y4			60%		

				quality managers of national laboratories in order to explain how this concept can be applied in Latin America to provide certain guarantees to agencies of evaluation.		
<b>Output 4.1.3</b> Detailed action protocol for responding to contamination risks and events developed	Q4 Y2	n/a (or done)	n/a (or done)	In the second semester the aim is to improve the protocol of action against complaints for DINAMA, although up to the date of this report it has not been possible to specify clear lines of work.	0%	In the steering committee the subject was raised in view of the delay of the output. In that instance, from the MGAP they expressed that they already have a harmonized protocol, for that reason they do not consider necessary to cover. However, from the DINAMA they want to improve the complaints system.
	Q4 Y2				0%	
<b>Output 4.1.4</b> Strengthened institutional capacity for environmental monitoring of pesticides	Q4 Y2	n/a (or done)	n/a (or done)	Four exchange workshops were held for DINAMA and departmental municipalities. They addressed topics such as; the adjustment of the methodology applied and preliminary results of the basin that is being monitored (output 4.1.1) (27 trained people).	68%	Through the recommendation of the MTR, the output target is adjusted to 40 trained workers, since DINAMA is the maximum number of people identified as possible participants in this way, increasing the institutional capacity strengthened for environmental monitoring of pesticides.
<b>Output 4.1.5</b> Sites in at least 3 watersheds selected for monitoring and	Q2 Y4	n/a (or done)	The Pesticide Monitoring Program is being developed in Laguna del Cisne	This output is associated with the execution of the Plans (Pesticide Monitoring Program) that are	43%	This output depends on the execution of the plans that are being developed as part of Output 4.1.1 corresponding to the same sites.

analysis of pesticide contamination			(Canelones).	being developed as part of Output 4.1.1.		
<b>Output 4.1.6</b> Measures to minimize pesticide contamination in watersheds identified and implemented	Q2 Y4	n/a (or done)	n/a (or done)	n/a (or done)	0%	It depends on the result of monitoring and is pending of its execution.

## Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

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

Max 200 words:

During this period, in Component 1 the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) was approved technically with a draft resolution proposal from DINAMA, requiring only the signature in the resolution plan to start the operations. The development of the guide and its graphic design finished. In Component 2 proposals for improvement of regulations were developed and delivered for 4 of the 5 stages of the life cycle of the pesticides. In addition to the outcome, biomarker studies and a program for vigilance of workers exposed to agricultural pesticides are carried out. In Component 3 as alternatives to pesticides, different lines were used as biological control agents for pest control; monitoring and management strategies in extensive crops; use of service crops (cover) for weed control, as well as studios in bio-pesticides/bio-fertilizers to support this development in the substitution of pesticides. In Component 4 the monitoring of the first priority basin finished, the results are being evaluated very positively, because they allowed generating work protocols and knowledge about the dynamics of the pesticides in that basin. The inter-institutional work carried out with DGSA and DINAMA has had very good results in the analytical development, validation and accreditation of techniques, supported by the international consultant.

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

Max 200 words:

It is a challenging project, in that it involves multiple actors, and has ambitious targets foreseen in each component. The likelihood that project achievements are sustainable over time is mainly associated with the occurrence of the following factors (i) political priority and (ii) appropriation of the products delivered, by the relevant actors. However, the project has had a notable increase in execution in recent times, from the acceleration in decision making, to maintain and take advantage of the opportunities that have been opened for inter-institutional work (at the government level), it will be possible to specify deliverables, and much of the results at the end of the project. It is highlighted that one of the challenges of the project is the approval of the Environmental Management Plan, which directly affects the times of achievement of the outcomes.

**Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment**

	FY2019 Development Objective rating <sup>15</sup>	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating <sup>16</sup>	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
--	--	--	--

---

<sup>15</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. 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.

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

<p><b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b></p>	<p><b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b></p>	<p><b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b></p>	<p>As reflected in the progress of the outputs mentioned above, the project has taken important steps, in technical and institutional terms, in a context of complex execution. In particular to undertake activities by different institutions (with conflicting interests), which have different degrees of accumulation and priority.</p> <p>The progress in some key outputs that have required major articulation efforts with other stakeholders that have taken more time than expected, for example; advance in normative matters for the management of pesticides, diagnosis and agreements to improve their national registry; the advance in the identification and validation of integrated pest management techniques, the agreements with the academy and private for their achievement, and the training carried out within the framework; the validation of environmental monitoring methodology for pesticides in watersheds, their implementation and; the strengthening of the analysis laboratories. However, these progresses are diluted due to the lack of progress in a key point such as the approval of the Environmental Management Plan and the beginning of the elimination of obsolete pesticides. Although there is a plan presented and technically approved, the signature of the resolution that enables the start of its execution is still pending.</p> <p>The three Ministries have expressed that the priority of the project remains valid, and that they perceive it as an opportunity for intersectoral work on the subject of production-environment-health, and in practice it has been in its incorporation of its lines of work in the strategic institutional guidelines. In this sense, both the Academy and the Research Agency have also incorporated these lines of work that have been initiated from the project, accounting for other positive impacts that the project generates but are not measured through any indicator.</p>
<p><b>Budget Holder</b></p>	<p><b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b></p>	<p><b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b></p>	<p>Although relevant progress has been achieved, the lack of progress in the approval of the Environmental Management Plan and the delay in the beginning of the elimination of obsolete pesticides requires attention from the Project team and this Officer in Charge in paying attention in order that progress in this issue happen.</p>

<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	Delivery of some key results is lagging behind – namely disposal management results. Despite the EMP development the government does still not endorse it. Urgent efforts are needed to complete all activities under disposal component.
<b>CBC-GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	The project design was very ambitious. After the MTR, the Project Team has succeeded in incorporating the MTR’s recommendations and addressing new outcome and output targets, despite the institutional constraints. The complex distribution of institutional mandates regarding pesticides management in the country has prevented the achievement of some project targets, particularly with regard to the pesticides registry and the POPs elimination. POPs elimination is central to the GEF Chemicals Focal Area, in line with the Stockholm Convention’s mandate, and considered as the main Global Environmental Benefit (GEB) the project is expected to deliver. In view of that, the Project Team should make double efforts to raise awareness of the project counterparts on the importance of achieving this outcome in the last project year (2019/20).

---

<sup>17</sup> 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)

<b>Overall Project Risk classification</b> (at project submission)	<b>Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid<sup>18</sup>.</b> If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Medium	N/A

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

#### Risk ratings

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

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

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

<sup>19</sup> GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

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

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Delays in the adoption of updated norms and procedures, and lack of inter-institutional coordination.	Medium	Regarding the normative issue, the mitigation strategy was continuing with campaigns of promotion and awareness-raising for Government representatives and staff, the commercial sector and final users. Closer contacts are being held at technical level and authorities. While for the pesticide use / application stage, as there is still resistance to discussing the issue through the Working Group and with DINAMA, the proposal that emerged from the work was sent to the MGAP for its consideration, in order not to keep stuck. For these reasons, the stages of the life cycle that do not depend on the MGAP have been addressed, advancing in the Storage and Transportation stage with the working group. The same mitigation action is continued, incorporating other actors to field activities, relevant to research and academia, as well as deepening the work with other MGAP directorates, such as for example: DIGEGRA. These strategies allowed for the integration of new stakeholders into the project and decreased dependence on the DGSA, obtaining very positive results and compliance for all the counterparts	The implemented strategy has had results since to date 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.	

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
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	It is expected that the accession of the private sector will increase with the content of the material available in training, interactive videos and files on the Prevention and Action Guide to incidents / accidents in the handling of pesticides.	Although the private sector lacks new initiatives, all the proposals made by the project have been well received. Good results have also been requested, for example, with the collection days held and the guides to incidents / accidents in the handling of pesticides, in order to achieve adherence to the management plans.	
3	The budget available is not enough for the environmentally sound disposal of identified stockpiles of obsolete pesticides.	Low	According to current regulations, importers and formulators of pesticides will be responsible for the disposal of obsolete stocks. Should the available budget be insufficient, the private sector will be responsible for the proper storage of pesticides and covering its elimination through the obsolete management plan (Decree 152/013).	The Environmental Management Plan presented by the private sector was approved technically; there is a draft resolution proposal from DINAMA. Requiring only the signature in the resolution plan to start the operations.	

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Low level of commitment of the authorities (National Directors), as well as the members of the meeting groups of each component	Low	<p>As a mitigation strategy, the PCU proposed in the Project Steering Committee the lines of work to be developed in the semester, in order to obtain formal responses (validation), avoiding delays and also allowing to decide in which activities they want to participate in the project.</p> <p>As for the work groups, they work very well according to the objectives of the project.</p>	Although we can affirm that globally there are still difficulties in this risk, from the direct approaches in the committee, there have been no obstacles because each institution decides in what action to actively participate in the project.	
5	Resistance in the integration of improvements in the registry and evaluation ERA by authorities.	High	<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>	The presentation to the authorities through international consultancy has been achieved as a mitigation, a proposal for improvement in the national registry that is currently being discussed by the counterparts.	

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
6	Not being able to meet the target of eliminating 160 tons of obsolete pesticides during the execution of the project.	Substantial	This risk does not depend on the project, because the elimination depends on the approval of DINAMA for initial operations.	<p>The Environmental Management Plan was approved technically, after Campo Limpio presented to DINAMA. Although its approval was agreed in the last committee project, this has not happened yet.</p> <p>The PCU communicate to the authority on the need to approve the plan as soon as possible. Once DINAMA approves, establishes deadlines for the start of activities for the elimination of the Environmental Management Plan.</p>	It highly advisable that the project team strive for achieving this outcome. Uruguay has a commitment with the Stockholm Convention and the GEF. This achievement would also facilitate the country's access to future Chemicals Focal Area projects.
7	During the fourth year of the project (2019) in the country Presidential Elections will be held.	Medium	<p>A change of authorities implies a risk since it can affect the lines of work that each institution decides to follow.</p> <p>Complementarily, the project carries out the strategy of accelerating the processes that require key decisions, before the change of government (e.g. national regulations)</p>	In this risk the PCU cannot influence, however, the project continues to accelerate all the processes that require political decision making.	

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
8	Not being able to complete the third basin of pesticide monitoring with GEF funds.	High	<p>The cost of the first basin monitored (Laguna del Cisne) consumed twice the originally budgeted for this activity.</p> <p>As the authorities show interest in continuing this line of monitoring, the third basin will be carried out with UTF/URU/035/URU funds.</p>	A document was sent to sign a background reinforcement to the UTF project to be able to execute this third account.	

**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
Medium	Medium	<p>The results of the project will begin to be achieved at the end of the execution period, in accordance with the implementation strategy adopted. This is mainly due to the fact that the project provides products or services that must necessarily be incorporated by other actors to be implemented and produce the desired effects. In any case, there are advances in some significant products towards the achievement of results in the four components, which allow having a satisfactory forecast of compliance with results. However, it is important that the PCU quickly design and implement a mechanism to monitor the expected results, so that they can be lifted at the end of the execution period.</p> <p>Only in a referential way, if we take into account only the advances of the "Key Products" mentioned above, the progress towards achieving results measured in percentage reaches 69%. Based on this, it is estimated that the probability of achievement is medium-high.</p> <p>In any case, difficulties still persist for the measurement and fulfillment of some targets, which were not reached by the MTR, but which continue to be reported from the PCU as "with compliance difficulties". It is the case for ex. of the targets that imply the "updating" of regulations or "incorporation" of changes in the institutions, since the making of those decisions is strictly the competence and responsibility of the competent authorities. In this sense, it is suggested to change these expressions by "presented proposals", in order to compromise what the project can really achieve with the tools it has from its design.</p>

		<p>The results have not yet materialized, although the progress made in some "key" products for achieving them has been highlighted and they have taken longer than expected:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. the Environmental Management Plan;</li><li>2. progress in normative matters for the management of pesticides and agreements to improve the National Pesticide Registry;</li><li>3. advance in the validation of management strategies and alternatives to pesticides, with the training carried out;</li><li>4. Validation of environmental monitoring methodology for pesticides in watersheds and their implementation;</li><li>5. Strengthening of laboratories in the expansion of pesticide analysis and work to achieve ISO / IEC 17025 accreditation.</li></ol>
--	--	---

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months<sup>21</sup>

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project Outcomes</b>	No	
<b>Project Outputs 1.1.1</b>	Yes	This output is eliminated and its target is transferred to the output 1.1.2. As it was already reported in the last report by a change of strategy, its target will be unified to the next product.
<b>Project Outputs 1.1.2</b>	Yes	Through the MTR's recommendation for a change in the implementation strategy within the component, this output was eliminated and its target will be transferred to output 1.1.2.
<b>Project Outputs 1.1.4</b>	Yes	On the recommendation of the MTR, the target will be adjusted in order to train 80 people. These activities will be carried out once the environmental management plan is approved.
<b>Project Outputs 2.1.2</b>	Yes	This output is beyond the scope of the project updating the registry system, because this depends on a strictly political decision, it was proposed to limit the scope to "submitted proposal" and not "updated system" taking the proposal as an indicator.
<b>Project Outputs 2.1.4</b>	Yes	The ERA is included in the proposal to improve the Pesticide Registry and the implementation of it is not within the scope of the project (as already pointed out). The proposal submitted by the International Registry Consultant will be considered a proposal for improvement in the ERA of pesticides.
<b>Project Outputs 2.1.6</b>	Yes	When the project began, a pesticide information system had already been defined, for this reason the project will not address the issue and proposes to eliminate it.
<b>Project Outputs 3.2.1</b>	Yes	Based on the recommendations of the MTR, the proposed did not have an indicator of achievement measurement. Training materials have been generated such as "Primer" and "Content of courses". In the case of the course carried out with the Agricultural Plan, the theoretical material with the content used in the training was also generated.

<sup>21</sup> 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.

		<p>All these inputs will be used in the successive trainings to be held on the subject.</p> <p>There have been some short videos (30") about the field training sessions to be used in the dissemination of the strategies and alternatives proposed.</p> <p>During the second semester will generate other materials focused on the dissemination and awareness of the risks associated with the use of pesticides</p>
<b>Project Outputs 3.2.1</b>	Yes	Based on the recommendation of the MTR, it was proposed to change the target from "Work Workshops" to "Dissemination Activities" and propose a new indicator which will be submitted for consideration by the Project Steering Committee.
<b>Project Outputs 4.1.2</b>	Yes	Based on the recommendation of the MTR, the MSP's participation has been removed, as it does not have any laboratory.
<b>Project Outputs 4.1.4</b>	Yes	On the recommendation of the MTR, the target is set at 40 trained workers, since DINAMA is the maximum number of people identified as possible participants.

#### 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
<b>Project extension</b>	<p>Original NTE: July 2019                      Revised NTE: July 2020</p> <p>Justification:  Based on the recommendations of the MTR, the extension of the project is recommended for a period of one additional year, in order to be able to specify all the anticipated deliverables and their associated results.  It is relevant to re-plan the management structure and budget necessary for 2020, versus savings generated in execution.  The MTR also highlighted the progress in some key outputs that have required significant articulation efforts with other stakeholders and that have taken longer than expected. Examples: (i) the preparation of the Environmental Management Plan in Component 1, (ii) progress in regulatory matters for the management of pesticides and diagnostics and agreements to improve its national registry in Component 2, (iii) progress in the identification and validation of integrated pest management techniques, the agreements with the academy and private for their achievement, and the training carried out in the</p>

framework of Component 3, and (iv) the validation of environmental monitoring methodology for pesticides in watersheds with its implementation and (v) the strengthening of the analysis laboratories in Component 4. In this sense, the Mid-term Review recommended the extension of the project and the adjustment of some final targets of the outputs.

## 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)?**

Although gender mainstreaming was not approached from the Project Document, as far as possible the project seeks to improve in that aspect.

The PCU together with the MTR Team have identified the possibility of incorporating the gender perspective through at least three lines of work: (i) training in the use and application of pesticides, and the impact on health and specific precautions for women; (ii) the incorporation of these particularities that should be taken into account by women working in the field in the communication strategy; (iii) work on pesticide labeling regulations and precautions for the use in women. It is important to bear in mind that the project has been working on "gender" in the record of attendance to the days of training, as well as in the preparation of accident / incident guides in the handling of pesticides, including the cycle of pesticides and the care that should be taken at some important times, such as pregnancy.

The project has also health and social researchers in the agro-city of Guichón (Paysandú), where they are working with experiences of local doctors, who evaluate patients exposed to pesticides. A priori results have shown that hospital admissions for intoxications are more frequent in women than in men, although most women are not directly exposed to pesticides.

Finally, the project is working with a gender consultant from MGAP, who is contributing ideas to include in the project from her perspective.

Despite being close to the end of the project, it is intended to leave some main lines of work in the subject to include in this or future projects.

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

There are no indigenous people involved in the project.

## 7. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges and outcomes on stakeholder engagement

**National Directorate of Environment (DINAMA) – MVTOMA (public sector):** Leading national partner. Coordinate project implementation and project management along with the GEF Agency (FAO). Ensure the close collaboration with other ministries and participating entities. A work Plan is being carried out with the DINAMA laboratory in order to incorporate new assets in water samples, as well as validation and adjustments of analytical methodologies with multiple pesticide residues (participates in all outcomes).

**General Directorate of Agricultural Services (DGSA) – MGAP (public sector):** Support project implementation, in close collaboration with DINAMA, FAO, other ministries and participating entities. A work plan is also being carried out with the laboratory, in order to validate multi-residues in fruit, vegetables and cereals, as well as accreditation with the OUA (participates in 2.1 and 3.1).

**Ministry of Public Health (MSP) (public sector):** Support project implementation by providing inputs and expertise on health issues and aspects (participates in 2.1).

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.

**FAO:** Is the GEF Agency in Uruguay for the project responsible for the overall supervision and to ensure that GEF policies and criteria are adhered to and that the project meets its objectives and achieves expected outcomes in an efficient and effective manner (participates in all outcomes).

**Other MGAP's agencies and projects (General Directorate of Horticulture - DIGEGRA, National Institute of Agricultural Research -INIA, National Dairy Institute-INALE, National Viticulture Institute -INAVI, DACC) (parastate sector):** Participate in project implementation by providing inputs and experiences on the adaptation and adoption of technologies related to the rational use of pesticides at general and sector level (participates in 2.1 and 3.1).

**Commerce Chamber of Agrochemical Products (CAMAGRO, CANAFFI, civil association Campo Limpio and Others recycling companies) (private sector):** Represent 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. Participate in project activities related to the management of empty pesticide containers, and the elimination of obsolete pesticides stocks (participates in 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1).

**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) (Academic & research institutions):** Participate in project implementation with specific contributions to the role of academy (participates in 2.1, 3.1 and 4.1).

It is intended that the proposed new lines of work be continued by the institutions that will continue once the project ends.

**Latin American Network for Action against Pesticides (RAPAL), Network of Environmental NGOs (CEUTA, Net of Agroecology) (NGOs).** Civil society organizations aimed at promoting viable alternatives for the development of socially just, ecologically sustainable and economically viable agriculture. Participate in project implementation with specific contributions to the role of civil society in the use and sound management of pesticides (participates in 3.1).

**Private Companies: AUSID and Oilseeds Technological Bureau, AIA Rural communities: producers and their organizations, SOFOVAL, ARU, Rural Federation, ACA (Private Companies).** To support the implementation of the project activities related to IPM (Participates in the trainings 3.1 and 3.2).

**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.

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

Several training and dissemination activities continue, reaffirming the development of a stage of greater diffusion and search of appropriation of the strategies and tools that are being worked on with the project. This challenge will continue until the end of the project. As part of the training activities, dissemination and awareness of the risks on the use of pesticides and that involve all the strategies outlined above, the activities related to there are some of them:

Day of packaging recycling; It was executed with Campo Limpio, the General Directorate of the Farm (DIGEGRA-MGAP) and civil society organizations (Sociedad de Fomento Rural), two days of collection of containers in four sites of the department of Canelones, attended by 254 producers and more than 15,000 kg of plastic was collected. This initiative was evaluated very positively by all parties. From the PCU, an opinion poll was conducted for producers who came to deliver packaging, in order to gather information about the initiative and its possible future projection. About the same, 83% of the respondents evaluated the experience as very positive and expressed the need to repeat it, and for the majority it was the first time that took containers to a collection center. [Note](#)

- Seminar "3rd Conference of Good Agricultural Practices (BPA)" allowed to find different actors (academia, producers, government, civil society) with a diversity of exhibitions based on real experiences that generate adhesion and multidisciplinary synergy. The intention that the audience presents to learn and listen to a subject does they work in their discipline and work, but from a different angle. For example, doctors who listen to producers; or agronomic researchers who listen to environmental researchers. [Videos](#)

- Cover crops and roller as a method of mechanical control, when the topic was started neither academia nor private work on the subject, three years later there are producers who implement it as a tool, as well as FAGRo and INIA intends to follow this line of work in the future for the potential of tool in the reduction of pesticides.

- Alternative tools to pesticides for the fruit sector, successfully closed the experience carried out in conjunction with the participating institutions of the "More Technology" project in Colonia Valdense, through which collaborated in the training and dissemination of different tools that producers can incorporate to reduce the use of pesticides. At the end of this stage, the interest of the producers to continue incorporating management that allows them to improve the coexistence with their neighbors and lower the use of pesticides was highlighted. [Note](#)

In this site the second biological bed is installed and new activities are scheduled for the actors. The contribution of this study is important, since in addition to working on commercial properties (first time in Uruguay), more than 30 Active Principles are being evaluated (for which there is no information about their bioremediation at the regional level), adding another value to national and regional experiences. Proof of this was the expression of interest on the part of the Faculty of Chemistry to present a poster at a meeting of the "Society of Ecotoxicology, SETAC Argentina", which took place in 2018. [Note](#)

- Training in the correct, safe and effective use of phytosanitary products was a free blended course aimed at agronomists, with duration of 8 weeks at there were 102 professionals in attendance and two face-to-face sessions. The percentage of approval was 49%. It was evaluated positively, both in its quality and in the utility and applicability of its contents; for this reason will be repeated this year. The focus of this course was to update the subject at the national level and plan subjects that were not presented by the institutions before. [Curso Fitosanitarios](#)

Several of the courses proposed by the project do not have in recent years in Uruguay courses for professional updating of high technical quality in the subject. There is a high demand identification of need for this type of courses. This resulted in a high avidity for the professionals in training and in the evaluations of the course is repetitive the reference to the need to have courses like these, that help the technicians to make better decisions in the field. This also leads to the population of the country being more informed on the topic of pesticides. Another form of effective communication that has had the project and maintained the contact of the subject 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. [Link](#)

## 9. Co-Financing Table

<a href="#">Sources of Co-financing[1]</a>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Agency	FAO		300,000	195,000	102,000	300,000
Local Government	MVOTMA	In-kind and grant	2,008,000	1,585,200	800,000	2,608,000
Local Government	MGAP	In-kind	1,080,000	782,000	490,000	1,080,000
Civil Society Organization	Campo Limpio	In-kind	2,620,000	2,633,000	890,000	2,620,000
Local Government	OSE	In-kind	1,250,000	0	0	1,250,000
Local Government	MSP	In-kind	0	59,000	29,000	0
<b>TOTAL</b>			7,258,000	5,254,200	2,311,000	7,858,000

The lack of OSE financial is because the institution has not participated in the project. The delay in the execution of project activities has also delayed the financial contribution of the institutions.

The MSP did not plan to make contributions to the co-financing, however, it is materializing through contributions of technical resources.

[1] 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.

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

**Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

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