

FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2022 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022

Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	10
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	14
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	17
6. RISKS	19
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	22
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	23
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	24
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	25
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	26
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	27
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	28

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	RNE
Country (ies):	Morocco
Project Title:	Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides including POPs and Implementation of Pesticides Management Programme
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /MOR/041/GFF
GEF ID:	4738
GEF Focal Area(s):	POPs
Project Executing Partners:	Moroccan Government, CropLife International, FAO
Project Duration (years):	4 years
Project coordinates:	<p>C1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Obsolete Pesticides stores name and coordinates (available in full list in the project documents upon request) and we will only cite the two central collection centers CCC and the 5 intermediate collection centers ICC: - Centre National de lutte antiacridienne (CNLAA) Tiznit, N 29°60'47" - W 9°71'77" - Centre de développement agricole (CDA) Sidi Kacem, N 34°56'38" W 5°99'65" - CT 10-02 Berrechid N 32°98'60" – W 7°61'29" - CDA 510 (Béni Oukil) N 32°57'22" – W 6°84'40" - CT 32-10 Rass Tabouda N 34°01'06" – W 4°97'33" - CDA 224 Belksiri N 34°56'38" – W 5°99'65" - CT 20-02 Asilah N 35°43'78" – W 6°04'03" <p>C2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The pilot empty pesticide container management project is planned in souss massa (N 30°40'00" W 7°30'00") -Department of Environment (Ministry of Environment) N 33°95'53" , W 6°87'24" <p>C3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Several Ministries (environment, agriculture, health) - Technical governmental bodies such as: -Office National de Sécurité Sanitaire des produits Alimentaires (ONSSA) N 33°99'81" , W 6°85'82" -Laboratoire Officiel d'Analyse et de Recherche Chimique (LOARC) N 33°59'52" , W 7°60'58"⁸⁷ -Direction Epidémiologie Et Lutte Contre Maladies N 33°99'50" , W 6°85'14" <p>C4</p> <p>Citrus farming area including small farmers, extensionists and Ministry of Agriculture – National Office of Agricultural Council (ONCA) N 33°97'71" , W 6°86'27"</p> <p>Region Gharb N 34°30'00" W 6°00'00"</p>

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	12/05/2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01/03/2015
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30/11/2018
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ²	30/11/2022

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 3,500,000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc³:	USD 24,246,626
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2022 (USD)⁴:	USD 2,693,544
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2022⁵	USD 11,995,840

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

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

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

M&E Milestones

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	26 October 2019
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	First quarter of 2018
Actual Mid-term review date (when it is done):	August – September 2018
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	End 2022
Tracking tools/Core indicators updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	No

Overall ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	MS
Overall implementation progress rating:	MS
Overall risk rating:	M

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	M
---	---

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Narjis Bouarourou	Narjis.Bouarourou@fao.org
Budget Holder	Jean Senahoun	Jean.Senahoun@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Oxana Perminova	Oxana.Perminova@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Maude Veyret-Picot	Maude.VeyretPicot@fao.org

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

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

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

Outcomes	Outcome indicators ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start Level at 30 June 2022	Progress rating ¹¹
Outcome 1	a) 850 Tons of POPs and other pesticides safeguarded/ disposed.	850 tons inventoried in Pesticide Stock Management System(PSMS) (2009, ASP)	Environmental Management Plans and Environmental Impact Assessment complete and approved Contract signed for disposal 200t repacked and eliminated	800 tons safeguarded and eliminated	-Collection of obsolete pesticides in several regions of Morocco: South, Fes-Meknes, Errachidia, Oriental, North, Beni Mellal. - Reconditioning of stocks of obsolete pesticides and empty pesticide packaging reaching more than 563 tonnes, of which 209 have already been exported/safely disposed of. - Significant delay due to the COVID 19 travel restrictions and the delay in responding to the focal points of the ministries to have the contacts of the resource persons on the site or due to the request of certain private sites to have a document attesting that FAO takes care of this waste.	MS
	b) Number of heavily contaminated sites remediated	0 site remediated	Site specific proposals for 2 sites	Site specific proposals will be prepared for 10 contaminated sites. Following this, and depending on the	-Engagement of a consortium of companies for the preparation and implementation of a strategy for the remediation of priority sites contaminated by pesticides in Morocco. -First stage in progress: Examination and compilation of the information available for the 5 sites chosen by the FAO and its partners, with the	MU

⁸ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

⁹ 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.

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

¹¹ 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).

				remaining budget, a limited number of sites will be remediated (2).	support of the project management unit for the selection of the 3 most relevant sites for the realization of the campaigns of investigations of the environmental environments which could be potentially impacted by the pollutants which are the object of the project.	
Outcome 2	a) Number of empty containers triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling; % of all containers collected/buried/ reused	Of 115, 000 containers generated annually, 0 are triple rinsed, collected and recycled 75% of certified farms store containers onsite No data on non-certified farms	15,000 are triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling and /or disposal	100,000 containers are triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling and /or disposal. Legacy containers that cannot be triple rinsed are disposed under Outcome 1 if possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A draft management strategy for empty pesticide containers has been developed based on the benchmarking study, and all the exchanges of several meetings with stakeholders on the issues, needs and solutions for managing empty containers in Morocco: ONSSA, the Ministry of the Environment and Croplife. - The analytical study of EPC (empty pesticide containers) in Morocco: a test on the effectiveness of triple rinsing to decontaminate EPC was carried out. A test protocol to determine pesticide residues in empty containers after triple rinsing with running water has been prepared. - The draft strategy for the management of empty pesticide containers and an action plan for the pilot project for the management of empty pesticide containers in Souss Massa were prepared and presented to all stakeholders in the presence of the DG of ONSSA and the SG of the Department of the Environment. - Preparation of ToRs to engage an LOA with one of the service providers who works on the issue of EPC in the region of Souss Massa. 	MS
	b) National policy / action plan based on pilot adopted by Ministry of Environment	None	Management unit identified and pilot programme processes known	National programme for EPC management launched		
Outcome 3	a) Legislation and registration for all pesticides in compliance with EU Code	Lack of regulation for pesticide used in public health		Legislation and registration for all pesticides in compliance with Code / EU	New consultations have been offered by ONSSA on preparations for the application of Law 34-18 on plant protection products:	S

				Regulation completed	<p>*Training: Sensitization of stakeholders and actors on the provisions of the law on plant protection products.</p> <p>*Consultation: Drafting of texts for the application of the law on phyto-pharmaceutical products.</p>	
	b) Customs sampling efficiency (=Number of non-conforming/ total number samples taken at Casablanca port border).	2.5% (20/780 total)	Risk analysis of imports complete; customs agents trained, and sampling strategy approved	Average 3.5% (yr. 3) and 4.2% (yr. 4) of samples identify non-compliances as same # non compliances detected with fewer total samples of high-risk shipments	<p>Signature of a letter of agreement with the Walloon Center for Agronomic Research (W-CAR) on Improving the analysis capacities of the Official Laboratory for Chemical Analysis and Research (LOARC). Several changes have been made to the initial version of the LoA (carrying out remote activities and virtual meetings as much as possible).</p> <p>The same LOA signed last year did not come to fruition because of covid-related restrictions because the W-CAR experts could not come to Morocco.</p>	
	c) Information exchanged by compliance and enforcement institutions.	No formal mechanism for exchange e.g. notification of new registrations	Capacity building for personnel in charge of pesticide inspection and training on sampling and inspection.	Formal mechanism established; registration decisions shared	A new information exchange system has been set up between the Departments and Institutions responsible for monitoring and tracing pesticides.	
Outcome 4	a) % of network farmers using alternatives (e.g. IPM) and HHP/POPs	1. Export driven farmers expected to use alternatives but not small holders; and vice versa for HHP/POPs (to be	N/A	50% increase in the baseline figure	- Despite some implementation difficulties a draft guide for the integrated management of citrus pests has been developed, including field research on natural enemies (predators and parasites), and presenting options for biological control and the introduction of alternatives to conventional chemicals.	MU

	b) Proxy for use of alternatives (TBD)	confirmed by planned baseline study)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organization of the workshop for the presentation and validation of the guide to good management practices for the main citrus pests and diseases in Morocco. - Examination of the guide by the scientific committee of experts in the field of citrus growing and formulation of suggestions and recommendations with a view to enriching and finalizing it. - The training material is already prepared and the training for ONCA national advisers and agricultural services is in the planning phase. 	
		2. Several companies produce beneficial insects in Souss Massa				

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: Risks to human health and the environment reduced through safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of pesticide-contaminated soil	Solve the problem of opening the Portnet account to be able to export the stocks of obsolete pesticides already collected and repackaged.	FAO Morocco, HQ (LEG services) and Moroccan Government	End of August 2022
Outcome 2: Reduce health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their reuse	Find a solution (mainly an extension of the project for an additional year) to conduct the pilot project for a period of one year while the rest of the duration of the project does not exceed 5 months	FAO Morocco	End of August 2022
Outcome 4: Reduced use of conventional chemical pesticides through promotion of alternatives	Validate, edit, and distribute the guide to good practices on citrus fruits	FAO Morocco + Scientific Committee	End of September 2022

c) Information exchanged by compliance and enforcement institutions.

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Output 1.1 <i>Safeguarding and disposal strategy in line with national and international best practice</i>			Output completed at the 3rd PIR	
Output 1.2 <i>Safeguarding, export and destruction of inventoried waste completed in an environmentally sound manner</i>	400 tons exported	350 tonnes collected of which less than 100 tons exported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collection and repackaging in progress: collection from satellite sites completed in several regions: North, South, Beni Mellal, Fes-Meknes, Errachidia and Oriental region (east of Morocco). - Export of almost 14 containers: 563 tons, of which 209 have already been exported. - Export blocked due to problems opening a Portnet account. <p>Since the beginning of 2022, several changes in Moroccan customs regulations have led to the export of collected stocks.</p> <p>While the collection operations are on the right track, the export of obsolete pesticides is on stand-by pending a solution on the signing of two documents (with items that FAO cannot legally accept), a necessary step for the opening</p>	

¹² Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹³ 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)

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

			<p>of an FAO account on Portnet: a platform at the national level to facilitate export procedures with customs (entry and exit of products).</p> <p>With the help of our freight forwarder, all the steps taken to find another way (without going through the signature of the two documents) and export the obsolete pesticides already reconditioned and stored in centers belonging to the government, failed.</p>	
Output 1.3 Contaminated sites remediated			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultation on the preparation and implementation of a strategy for the remediation of priority sites contaminated by pesticides in Morocco. - Choice of 5 sites by FAO and its partners from the list of contaminated sites in Morocco. - Examination and compilation of the information available on these 5 sites (in progress), for the selection of the 3 most relevant sites for the realization of the campaigns of investigations of the environmental environments which could be potentially impacted by the pollutants which are the object of the project. - The field missions of the 5 sites are being prepared. 	
Output 2.1. Container management pilot implemented in Sous Massa	Pilot project launched: number of triple rinsed containers, collected and stored	LOA prepared but pilot project not launched	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ToRs of the pilot project on the management of empty pesticide containers are prepared and the LOA prepared (between the steering committee held in October and December). - The service provider for the LOA is chosen, but clearance was pending until March.- The problem is that the remaining time of the project (March – November: less than 1 year) is not enough to launch all the activities planned in the LOA and the service provider did not agree to sign the LOA. 	
Output 2.2. National strategy for container management	The management strategy for empty packaging prepared.	The management strategy for empty packaging prepared.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The management strategy for empty packaging in Morocco has been prepared and validated by the partners: ONSSA, Department of Sustainable Development and Croplife. - The test on the effectiveness of triple rinsing in decontaminating EVP has been carried out. - An action plan for the pilot project for the management of empty pesticide packaging in Sous Massa was prepared and presented to all stakeholders in the presence of the DG of ONSSA and the SG of the Department of Sustainable Development. 	
Output 3.1. Pesticide management legislation and registration system	--	--	<p>New activities have been proposed, in particular training on preparations for the application of Law 34-18 on plant protection products:</p> <p>*Sensitization of stakeholders and actors on the provisions of the law on plant protection products.</p>	

<i>revised and improved in conformity with the Code and EU regulations</i>			*Drafting of texts for the application of the law on phytopharmaceutical products.	
Output 3.2 <i>Pilot pesticide import control system implemented at Casablanca port</i>	--	--	No activity during this year as part of this output.	
Output 3.3 <i>Chemical Analysis and Research Laboratory (LOARC) analytical capacity enhanced</i>	LOARC capacities are strengthened.	LOA in progress	The LoA with the CRA-W, on improving the analytical capabilities of LOARC on the analysis of pesticide formulations and residues, is in progress.	
Output 3.4 <i>Mechanism for information exchange on pesticide quality and food safety established</i>	--	--	No activity during this year as part of this output.	
Output 4.1. <i>Typology study conducted and alternatives identified in Sousse Massa</i>	The guide to good management practices for the main citrus pests and diseases in Morocco edited	Guide not yet finalized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Launch of the consultation on improving the management of pests and diseases and the promotion of alternatives to reduce the use of chemicals (Citrus fruits). - A guide to good management practices for the main citrus pests and diseases in Morocco has been drawn up and submitted for validation (suggestions and recommendations) by a scientific committee of experts before it is published for use on a large scale in the training of trainers and agricultural advisers, and also making it available to producers. - Guide being finalized by the consultant. 	

<i>Output4.2 Alternatives promoted to farmers and extension service providers</i>	expected after June 2022.		This phase is awaiting the deliverables of Output 4.1	
--	---------------------------------	--	---	--

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.

C1:

- Component 1 is now on track. Indeed, FAO, Veolia and Moroccan government are working together to achieve the expected results, relating to packaging and collection from satellite sites. To date, more than 10 containers have been exported (208 tons) and 439 tons reconditioned, but since the start of the 2022, several changes in Moroccan customs regulations have led to the export of collected stocks to be delayed. The export is pending to find a solution (FAO is in contact with those responsible for Portnet to change some articles in the documents to be signed for the access to the Portnet Platform).
- Preparation of two new notifications by Veolia.

C2:

The LOA on the pilot project for the management of empty pesticide containers is ready to be signed by FAO and the chosen service provider. This will make it possible to validate the ECP management strategy developed under the project and/or make adjustments if necessary. There was a delay in the validation of the ToRs of the pilot project action plan, which affected the start of the pilot project. The time devoted to the LOA is one year and the time remaining at the time of validation was 7 months. Therefore, the service provider did not agree to sign the LOA.

C4 :

- A guide to good management practices for the main citrus pests and diseases in Morocco is being finalized by the consultant, in order to launch the training of trainers and make it available to producers through demonstrations in the field.

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.

	FY2022 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2022 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2022 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<p><i>The project has not progressed at the expected rate for many reasons beyond our control, the complexity of the project, Moroccan legislation but also the validations required.</i></p> <p><i>Overall progress has been satisfactory. This year was devoted to the preparation of all the preliminary stages (ToRs, LoA, guide, commitment of comm agencies, etc.) of the activities of the action plan validated by the steering committee (October 2021). There were delays due to the approval of all these activities, either by the GEF or by the national party.</i></p> <p><i>Indeed, explicitly, the work of component 1 on safeguarding and disposal of obsolete pesticides is blocked because of a customs problem. At the time of the implementation of the pilot project on EPC (component 2), it was found that the remaining duration of the project is insufficient to carry it out properly. The guide on good management practices for the main citrus pests and diseases in Morocco (component 4) was delayed due to its validation by experts in the field.</i></p>
Budget Holder	S	MS	<p><i>Project has been confronted with several challenges beyond control due to its complex nature. Difficulties related to the requirement to register to Portnet, a newly created platform, has caused further delay during the period under review. Actions are being taken to resolve pending issues and increase project performance. .</i></p>

¹⁵ **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.

¹⁶ **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.

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸			<i>Comments and ratings from OFP were not received within the set deadline for PIR final submission</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	MS	<i>While the project is expected to achieve its objectives, the situation with the COVID-19 pandemic caused delays in implementation. Despite the delays in the implementation of some activities has advanced satisfactorily. With another no-cost extension requested by the project, it would be possible to dispose of the remaining obsolete pesticides stocks as a lot of effort is being made to speed up the disposal and safeguarding process. Stakeholders are fully engaged regarding all components of the project.</i>
FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MS	MU	<i>There are a number of external factors that have delayed the progress to deliver key results. However, the project seems to face one challenge after the other and seems to struggle to find prompt solutions to overcome these challenges. The project is now in its 7th year of implementation, and progress on all its components is limited. Furthermore, it is not clear whether the ambition of the project will be achieved or the project will under-perform with respect to expected results and outcomes. Technical and Steering meetings have taken place, but have not engaged the FAO Project Task Force, and minutes are not shared for review and consideration with Project Task Force members. The project management unit is requested to develop a work plan and budget revision, clear risk contingency plan for the remaining project implementation period, with the aim to close activities and engage the terminal evaluation within the coming fiscal year. Despite the challenges, however, the disposal of the many tonnes of obsolete pesticides (once finalised what has been engaged) will deliver great environmental and health benefits. The components on enabling policy environment and alternatives to chemical use still need to deliver results that can sustain achievements through time.</i>

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

¹⁹ 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
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

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 ²⁰ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Medium	Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid from the prior PIR Potential for environmental impairment particularly in the event of an accident in the removal, transport and elimination of the obsolete pesticides

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>

²⁰ **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 ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Environmental contamination from leakage of POPs and other obsolete pesticides due to poor conditions of containers.	M	N	Environmental Management Plan, Health and Safety Plans and supervision of operations for risk mitigation of safeguarding operations.	The collection, packaging and transport operations are going very well. Supervision missions are carried out regularly.	No change, the ESS risk management plan duly considered this potential risk and identified adequate management actions.
2	Insufficient funds for safeguarding of major contaminated sites, the disposal of POPs and other project activities	M	N	Reduce the number of sites and concentrate efforts on 3 sites as to insure local team training so they can ensure decontamination once all pesticides are eliminated	Training is programmed in the contract with the service provider selected for this.	In October 2022

²¹ 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 ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Insufficient national capacity in undertaking evaluation and decontamination of pesticide contaminated sites	H	N	Trainings by project experts and Véolia on safeguarding activities are planned, anticipating the risk of capacity gaps.	N/A (done)	Training has been delivered and the risk has been minimised.
4	Low existing use and uptake of alternative technologies by producers.	L	Y	Farmers' awareness, in collaboration with the producer organizations Recruitment of an national consultant who will determine alternatives to pesticides for citrus fruits FFS are planned according to the needs of Minagri.	Development of a guide on alternatives for citrus fruits.	No change
5	Pesticide companies/ distributors and farmers do not support the project	L	Y	The necessary advocacy actions will be undertaken in the context of the project communication strategy	-The communication strategy developed include capacity building for all key people in the management of empty pesticide packaging to support the project in raising awareness of the danger of pesticides. -Communication agency engaged	No change

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Customs non-compliance during the implementation of the new pesticides control system at entry points.	L	N	Custom authorities are supportive of the project	N/A (done)	No longer relevant
7	Covid-19 Pandemic	M	N	Postponing activities needing physical presence/travel/functional services, Virtual meetings for all activities that can allow progress in this way	No cost extension requested to allow to complete the project. Draft extension documents and agreements for postponed activities ready.	

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	No change in the risk rating compared to 2021. In order to allow all activities to be completed and targets to be met and considering the many challenges the project faces (recent impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic slowing down delivery and adding uncertainty to the overall planning), a new action plan for 2021/2022 was presented and approved during the steering committee held in October 2021.

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: Focus on results and adaptation of the schedule	-Regular supervision of Veolia aimed to respect the EIA specifications during all operations to secure and collect obsolete pesticides. -Organization of meetings with stakeholders of the EVP management component. -A new 2021-2022 work plan is approved in the steering committee to adapt the initial planning to government requirements and overcome the difficulties encountered
Recommendation 2: Implementation of the gender factor	The project planned to involve more women in the training provided under the project. With the health situation linked to COVID, no training has been held in this regard.
Recommendation 3: Internal organization and communication within the PMU and its members	Project coordination tries to report to PMU members on the status of the project, but the health situation does not allow this to be done as frequently as before the pandemic.
Recommendation 4: Stakeholder involvement	All project stakeholders are integrated and provide support for project implementation. It is planned to also integrate producer associations, distributors, cooperatives, aggregators and civil society.
Recommendation 5 Project sustainability	All project stakeholders are included and provide support for the implementation of the project. It is also planned to include associations of producers, distributors, cooperatives, aggregators, and civil society.
Recommendation 6 Project extension	After the mid-term evaluation, two project extensions were requested to allow the implementation of all project activities.
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please describe	No

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 Guidelines²². 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	No		
Components and cost	No		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	No		
Financial management	No		
Implementation schedule	Extension of the project	Before NTE of the project	LTO/BH not yet approved by GEF Coordination Unit, as they requested further details on AWP/B and risk mitigation plan.
Executing Entity	No		
Executing Entity Category	No		
Minor project objective change	No		
Safeguards	No		
Risk analysis	No		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	No		
Co-financing	No		
Location of project activity	No		
Other	No		

²² 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
Government Institutions			
Ministry of Agriculture (ONSSA)	Facilitation of project activities - Financing	Continuous support	--
Department of Environment (ex. MoE)	Principal stackholder of Component 2	Too reluctant to make a decision on the progress of this component	Moroccan law does not favor the pilot project
Ministry of Interior: CNLAA	Main role in component 1 (CCC)	Exceptional support	--
Ministry of Health	Role in component 1	Role especially in providing contacts focal points of satellite sites	--
Customs Authority	Facilitation of OP export	-Entry of OPs without payment of import taxes -Find a solution of Portnet registration (in progress)	--
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
ASPAM	Component 4	Not started yet	--
Private sector entities			
Crop Life International	Financing		
CropLife Morocco	Comp 1 and 2	Integrated into all the prestations of these two comps	--

10. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Category	Yes/No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	No	This year's activities did not focus on gender since the action plan (remaining activities in the project) focused on resolving issues that were more legislative than implementation related.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	No	
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
a) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources	No	
b) improving women's participation and decision making	No	
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	Yes	Participate in reducing the danger of pesticides on vulnerable people (women and children): management of EVPP and elimination of PO
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?		
Staff with gender expertise	No	
Any other good practices on gender	No	

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval <u>during this reporting period.</u>	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	All project deliverables are integrated into FAO's FPMIS.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	Yes, a communication strategy was developed last year, integrating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of communication supports (component 2 and 4): Committed communication agency. - Production of an institutional film (comp 1): in progress. - Support awareness-raising actions for the benefit of farmers and organize awareness-raising campaigns in collaboration with Moroccan NGOs (comp 2): scheduled for September. - Production of a motion design awareness video capsule (comp 2): Committed communication agency.
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	N/A
Please provide links to related website, social media account	
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	In progress
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	The communication focal point is the communication officer of the FAO office in Morocco : Mme Lina Touri, Lina.Touri@fao.org

12. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Involvement

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

N/A

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	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
National Government	Office National de la Sécurité Sanitaire des produits Alimentaires (ONSSA)	Grant	1,000,000	1,000,000		1,000,000
National Government	ONSSA	In kind	8,300,000	7,361,340		8,300,000
National Government	Ministry of Health	Grant	250,000			250,000
National Government	Ministry of Health	In kind	1,600,000			1,600,000
National Government	CNLAA	In kind	900,000	900,000		900,000
Private sector	CropLife International	Grant	1,814,500	1,814,500		1,814,500
Private sector	CropLife International	In kind	1,005,000	920,000		1,005,000
TOTAL			14,869,500	11,995,840		14,869,500

²³ 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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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

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