



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

### 2023 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

## Table of contents

1. BASIC PROJECT DATA .....	2
2. PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVING PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) (DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE) .....	4
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	9
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS .....	12
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS) .....	15
6. RISKS .....	17
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION .....	20
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS .....	21
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	22
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING.....	23
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....	24
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT .....	25
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE.....	26

## 1. Basic Project Data

### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	RNE
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Morocco
<b>Project Title:</b>	Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides including POPs and Implementation of Pesticides Management Programme
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP /MOR/041/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	4738
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	POPs
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	Moroccan Government, CropLife International, FAO
<b>Initial project duration (years):</b>	4 years
<b>Project coordinates:</b> <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> <i>a) Projects with 1st PIR;</i> <i>b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.</i>	

### Project Dates

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	12/05/2014
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :</b>	01/03/2015
<b>Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	30/11/2018
<b>Revised project implementation End date (if approved) <sup>2</sup></b>	30/12/2023

### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	USD 3,500,000
<b>Total Co-financing amount (USD)<sup>3</sup>:</b>	USD 24,246,626
<b>Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):</b>	USD 2,930,014
<b>Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)<sup>4</sup>:</b>	USD 2,252,965
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023<sup>5</sup></b>	USD 11,995,840

### M&E Milestones

<sup>1</sup> As per FPMIS

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

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

<sup>4</sup> The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

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

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	26 October 2021
Expected Mid-term Review date <sup>6</sup> :	First quarter of 2018
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	August – September 2018
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date <sup>7</sup> :	End 2023
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) 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 <sup>st</sup> PIR, 2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR, etc. Final PIR):	8 <sup>th</sup> PIR
--	---------------------

### Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Narjis Bouarourou	<a href="mailto:Narjis.Bouarourou@fao.org">Narjis.Bouarourou@fao.org</a>
Budget Holder (BH)	Jean Senahoun	<a href="mailto:Jean.Senahoun@fao.org">Jean.Senahoun@fao.org</a>
GEF Operational Focal Point (GEF OFP)		
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Oxana Perminova	<a href="mailto:Oxana.Perminova@fao.org">Oxana.Perminova@fao.org</a>
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Maude Veyret-Picot	<a href="mailto:Maude.VeyretPicot@fao.org">Maude.VeyretPicot@fao.org</a>

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

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

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

*(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)*

Please indicate the project's main progress towards achieving its objective(s) and the cumulative level of achievement of each outcome since the start of project implementation.							
Project or Development Objective	Outcomes	Outcome indicators <sup>8</sup>	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target <sup>9</sup>	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress <sup>10</sup> since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating <sup>11</sup>
	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	a) 850 tons of POPs and other pesticides safeguarded/ disposed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantity reconditioned and not exported (Tiznit, Belksiri, Beni Oukil, Errachidia and Fes Meknes): 241,000 kg.</li> <li>• Quantity already exported: 208,576 kg.</li> </ul> = Total pesticides collected: approximately 450 tons. Rest by region: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quantity planned for Marrakech: 21 tons.</li> <li>Rabat: 26 tons.</li> <li>Casablanca: 68 tons (45 tons between AMAROC and SPV Casa).</li> </ul>	MS

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

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

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

<sup>11</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU). Refer to Annex 1.

						<p>Berrechid: 09 tons.          = Total not collected: 124 tons (to be confirmed – field visits).</p>	
		b) Number of heavily contaminated sites remediated	0 site remediated	Site specific proposals for 2 sites	<p>Site specific proposals will be prepared for 10 contaminated sites. Following this, and depending on the remaining budget, a limited number of sites will be remediated (2).</p>	<p>Visit of 6 sites from the list of sites inventoried by contaminated sites. No site meets the decontamination criteria.</p>	MS

	<b>Outcome 2</b>	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	Pilot project launched, in collaboration with Croplife and Agrotech and training of farmers carried out. Acquisition of Personal Protective Equipment and plastic bags that will be used to collect empty pesticides containers.	S
		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	After the evaluation of the current pilot project, Morocco can adopt a national strategy based on the results of this pilot project.	
	<b>Outcome 3</b>	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 Regulation completed	-National training workshop on the FAO Toolbox for pesticide registration. -Consultation on the experimentation of pesticides for agricultural use (Insecticides, nematicides, fungicides, herbicides) is progressing.	S

		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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output 1. Realization of the inventory of the Official Laboratory of Chemical Analysis and Research of Casablanca and assessment of capacities and needs (including skills, materials and procedures and management) through several virtual meetings and exchanges of documents and questionnaires.</li> <li>• Output 2. Training of the Laboratory staff team on the analysis of pesticide formulations and the use of equipment acquired, through a study tour of 3 LOARC executives.</li> </ul>	S
		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	The information exchange system is still functional.	S
	<b>Outcome 4</b>	a) % of network farmers using alternatives (e.g. IPM) and HHP/POPs b) Proxy for use of alternatives (TBD)	1. Export driven farmers expected to use alternatives but not small holders; and vice versa for HHP/POPs (to	N/A	50% increase in the baseline figure	Guide to good management practices for the main citrus pests and diseases in Morocco being finalized and edited. Delays had been accumulated due to quality concerns of the report.	MS

			be confirmed by planned baseline study)				
			2. Several companies produce beneficial insects in Souss Massa				

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<b>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</b>	Solve the problems related to the contract with Veolia in order to start the collection and repackaging of remaining quantities of obsolete pesticides.	FAO HQ, FAO Morocco	The end of the year 2023
<b>Outcome 4: Reduced use of conventional chemical pesticides through promotion of alternatives</b>	Finalize the guide and edit it.	FAO Morocco + ONSSA + New consultant	October 2023



### 3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs <sup>12</sup>	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements <sup>13</sup> (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> in delivering outputs
<b>Output 1.1</b> <i>Safeguarding and disposal strategy in line with national and international best practice</i>			Output completed at the 3rd PIR	
<b>Output 1.2</b> <i>Safeguarding, export and destruction of inventoried waste completed in an environmentally sound manner</i>	400 tons exported	350 tons collected of which less than 100 tons exported	Problem Portnet Resolved. Preparation of two new notification approved by the department of environment on February 2023. No export done. Capacity building of CNLAA staff on a thetraceability system Acquisition EPI and other materials	<b>At this point in the project, we should at least do two exports of 6 containers, representing approximately 78 tons.</b>
<b>Output 1.3</b>			The field mission did not detect any sites that could serve as contamination sites.	<b>Concrete sites cannot be used as a</b>

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

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

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

<b>Contaminated sites remediated</b>			The experts were unable to complete the environmental questionnaire through the data collected by the site managers (not enough information). A rapid environmental assessment was conducted, following the EMTK 5 process.	<b>decontamination site.</b>
<b>Output 2.1. Container management pilot implemented in Sous Massa</b>	Pilot project launched: number of triple rinsed containers, collected and stored	Pilot project launched	<b><u>Training of farmers carried out.</u></b> <b><u>Acquisition of Personal Protective Equipment and plastic bags that will be used to collect empty pesticides containers.</u></b> <b><u>Launch of the call for tenders for the collection and transport of EPCs.</u></b>	
<b>Output 2.2. National strategy for container management</b>	Pilot project launched: number of triple rinsed containers, collected and stored	LOA prepared but pilot project not launched	- The upcoming results of the pilot project will inform the strategy and action plan, modifying the draft documents already prepared. - Strengthening of the decision-making mechanism for the co-incineration in cement kilns of pesticide waste (obsolete pesticides, empty pesticide containers).	
<b>Output 3.1. Pesticide management legislation and registration system revised and improved in conformity with the Code and EU regulations</b>			- National training workshop on the FAO Toolbox for pesticide registration. - Consultation on the experimentation of Pesticides for Agricultural Use (Insecticides, nematocides, fungicides, herbicides).	
<b>Output 3.2 Pilot pesticide import control system implemented at Casablanca port</b>			No activity during this year as part of this output.	

<b>Output 3.3 Chemical Analysis and Research Laboratory (LOARC) analytical capacity enhanced</b>	LOARC capacities are strengthened.	LOA in progress	The contract with the CRA-W, on improving the analytical capabilities of LOARC on the analysis of pesticide formulations and residues, is progressing.	
<b>Output 3.4 Mechanism for information exchange on pesticide quality and food safety established</b>			No activity during this year as part of this output.	
<b>Output 4.1. Typology study conducted and alternatives identified in Sousse Massa</b>	The guide to good management practices for the main citrus pests and diseases in Morocco edited expected after June 2022.	Guide not yet finalized	Guide finalized and validated.	
<b>Output 4.2 Alternatives promoted to farmers and extension service providers</b>				

## 4. Summary on Progress and Ratings

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

### **C1:**

Component 1 still suffers from setbacks: after fixing the Portnet issue (the old notification expired). Two other notifications have been prepared to start the export of obsolete pesticides. In addition, another problem arose relating to the additional costs requested by the company Veolia (this problem is being solved). All relevant and required information was provided in a timely manner. Yet, in the meantime, the company suspended collection work in the remaining regions.

### **C2:**

- A pilot project was launched by Agrotech and Croplife.
- A consultation is underway to support the Department of Sustainable Development to decide on purpose and outlet of empty pesticide containers in Morocco.

### **C3 :**

- The contracting of LOARC is being finalised. A study trip was organized to strengthen the technical skills of the Laboratory for Chemical Analysis and Research (LOARC) officials. Skills acquired include the analysis of pesticide formulations in accordance with national and international standards.
- A national training workshop on the FAO Toolbox for pesticide registration was organized for the benefit of ONSSA executives.
- Training on the new law on plant protection products (PPP) was organized for the benefit of the new PPP commission.
- Consultation on the experimentation of pesticides for agricultural use (Insecticides, nematicides, fungicides, herbicides) is progressing.

### **Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment**

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	<b>FY2023 Development Objective rating<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>FY2023 Implementation Progress rating<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Comments/reasons<sup>17</sup> justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period</b>
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>The score would have been higher for 2023, but delays in project delivery have accumulated due to constraints linked to the export of obsolete pesticides required by government authorities and the additional costs requested by the company which stopped the collection. It would be unfortunate if we could not eliminate Morocco's stock of obsolete pesticides. An extension of the project would be welcome to meet the needs of the country and dispose of the remaining obsolete pesticides stocks as a lot of effort is being made to speed up the disposal and safeguarding process. There are stocks accumulated in government sites (CCI), and if by now the NTE of the project is not exported, it would be a failure of the project in Morocco.</i>
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>The BH is in agreement with observations of PTF members.</i>
<b>GEF Operational Focal Point<sup>18</sup></b>			
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>19</sup></b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<i>Despite the delays in the implementation of some activities have advanced. Technical and Steering meetings have taken place on a regular basis. The project advanced in safeguarding and disposal contract implementation. The operation</i>

<sup>15</sup> **Development Objectives Rating** – A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

<sup>16</sup> **Implementation Progress Rating** – A rating of the extent to which the implementation of a project's components and activities is in compliance with the projects approved implementation plan. For more information on ratings and definitions, please refer to Annex 1.

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

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

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

			<i>should be possible to complete by 31 December 2023, with this the project will deliver major global environmental benefits. It is recommended to proceed with terminal evolution and close the project by the end of 2023.</i>
<b>GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<p><i>Project progress has been slow, and major project components continue to face repeated challenges, halting the process. The safeguarding and disposal of pesticides will not be done for the expected 850tons. Yet, the policy and regulatory environment and technical capacity of national institutes for pesticide management has improved, impacting future safeguarding and disposal. Demonstration work remained limited in size and scope, while other activities have not been engaged.</i></p> <p><i>The terminal evaluation exercise has been initiated, as the project is expected to close at year-end. This exercise will provide an opportunity for a deep-dive analysis into the project's management, while also mapping its contribution to safeguarding of agricultural pesticides in the country. It will be an opportunity to reflect on the complexity of international disposal and the timeline needed for the elimination of dangerous chemicals, as well as the role of a finance partner as GEF in such an operation.</i></p>

## 5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

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

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

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

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate:

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

<sup>20</sup> **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit ([Esm-unit@fao.org](mailto:Esm-unit@fao.org)) should be contacted. The project shall prepare or amend an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) or other ESS instruments and management tools based on the new risk classification (please refer to page 13 <https://www.fao.org/3/cb9870en/cb9870en.pdf> )



## 6. Risks

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	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.	<b>No change, the ESS risk management plan duly considered this potential risk and identified adequate management actions.</b>
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.	<b>In October 2022</b>

---

<sup>21</sup> Risk ratings means a rating of accesses the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High. For more information on ratings and definitions please refer to Annex 1.

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
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)	<b>Training has been delivered and the risk has been minimised.</b>
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.	<b>No change</b>
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	<b>No change</b>

	Type of risk	Risk rating <sup>21</sup>	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	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.	An extension of the project has been approved until December 2023 to allow the remaining project activities to be finalized.

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

FY2022 rating	FY2023 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
M	M	No change in the risk rating compared to 2022.

## 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>
<b>Recommendation 1: Focus on results and adaptation of the schedule</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Regular supervision of Veolia aimed to respect the EIA specifications during all operations to secure and collect obsolete pesticides.</li> <li>-Organization of meetings with stakeholders of the EVP management component.</li> <li>-A new 2022-2023 work plan is prepared to adapt the initial planning to government requirements and overcome the difficulties encountered.</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation 2: Implementation of the gender factor</b>	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.
<b>Recommendation 3: Internal organization and communication within the PMU and its members</b>	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.
<b>Recommendation 4: Stakeholder involvement</b>	<p>All project stakeholders are integrated and provide support for project implementation.</p> <p>It is planned to also integrate producer associations, distributors, cooperatives, aggregators, and civil society.</p>
<b>Recommendation 5 Project sustainability</b>	<p>All project stakeholders are included and provide support for the implementation of the project.</p> <p>It is also planned to include associations of producers, distributors, cooperatives, aggregators, and civil society.</p>
<b>Recommendation 6 Project extension</b>	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 summarize	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 Guidelines<sup>22</sup>. Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework	No		
Components and cost	No		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	No		
Financial management	No		
Implementation schedule	Extension of the project until December 2023	November 2022	GEF Coordination Unit
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 minor project amendment (define)	No		

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

## 9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Role in project execution	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
<b>Government Institutions</b>			
Ministry of Agriculture (ONSSA)	Facilitation of project activities - Financing	Continuous support	--
Department of Environment (ex. MoE)	Principal stakeholder of Component 2	Too reluctant to make a decision on the progress of this component	Moroccan law does not favor the pilot project but the project find an issue
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)	--
<b>Non-Government organizations (NGOs)</b>			
ASPAM	Component 4	Not started yet	--
<b>Private sector entities</b>			
Crop Life International	Financing		
CropLife Morocco	Comp 1 and 2	Integrated into all the prestations of these two comps especially pilot project	--

## 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, during this reporting period.**

Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	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 <b>this year</b> .	Yes, a communication strategy was developed last year, integrating: - Development of communication supports (component 2 and 4): Committed communication agency. - Production of an institutionnel film (comp 1) : en attente le retour de Veolia au Maroc. - 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, <a href="mailto:Lina.Touri@fao.org">Lina.Touri@fao.org</a>



## 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 <sup>23</sup>	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
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
<b>TOTAL</b>			14,869,500	11,995,840		14,869,500

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

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

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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

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

## Annex 2.

### GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location & Activity Description

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.