



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



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:	4 years

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	12/05/2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01/03/2015
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30/11/2018
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	30/11/2020
Actual Implementation End Date³:	31/11/2020

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 3,500,000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	USD 24,246,626
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	USD 1,969,319
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	USD 9,712,720

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Review and Evaluation

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

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	S	All components of the project are in progress despite the complexity of this project. With the no-cost extension of the project until 2020, the project should achieve all its objectives.
Overall implementation progress rating:	S	The implementation progress rate of the project is good. All planned activities are underway with relevant partners.
Overall risk rating:	M	The project is of medium risk due to its nature and complexity (dealing with hazardous products spread over 387 sites in the country)

Status

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

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

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Narjis Bouarourou	Narjis.Bouarourou@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Elisabetta Tagliati	Elisabetta.tagliati@fao.org
Budget Holder	Florence Rolle	Florence.rolle@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Maude VEYRET- PICOT	Maude.VeyretPicot@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s):						
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	a) 850 Tons of POPs and other pesticides safeguarded/ disposed.	850 tons inventoried in PSMS (2009, ASP)	EMPs and EIA complete and approved Contract signed for disposal 200t repacked and eliminated @ \$4000 / tonne	800 tons safeguarded and eliminated @ Av cost = \$ 4,000/ton	-Contract signed with Veolia SP for 736 tonnes -Veolia's first mission to Morocco on the occasion of the March Steering Committee (several meetings with partners) -Launch of the environmental impact assessment of the two central collection centres(CCC) -Launch of the procedure for temporary importation of Protective Equipment. -Launch of the formalities of the Basel Convention (Two notifications under progress UK and France).	S
	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	- Contact made with a few international and national consultants to	

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

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

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

				depending on the remaining budget, a limited number of sites will be remediated (2). As a matter of fact, already at the inception workshop, it was acknowledged that the available budget (as per ProDoc) is low and may be only sufficient to cover one site remediation. If savings are made in disposal activities, remediation of additional sites should be considered as a priority	prepare and implement a strategy for the remediation of priority sites contaminated by pesticides in Morocco.	MS
Outcome 2: Reduce health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their reuse	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	-Organization of three training sessions for approximatively 100 farmers on Good Practices for Management of Empty Pesticide Packaging and triple rinsing and drilling. -Launch of a benchmarking study on the management of empty pesticide containers (EPC) in 5 countries (France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, UK). The study will examine the regulatory framework and the technical and economic feasibility of existing valorization chains -Preparation of a protocol for	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	<p>carrying out analysis of pesticide residues in empty containers after triple rinsing with running water underway.</p> <p>-Development of a national strategy for the management of empty pesticide packaging. Presentation of this strategy and the conditions for the establishment of a pilot PVT management program through a national workshop.</p>	MS
Outcome 3: Institutional and technical capacities for registration and post-registration system are enhanced	a) Legislation and registration for all pesticides in compliance with Code / EU	Lack of regulation for pesticide used in public health		Legislation and registration for all pesticides in compliance with Code / EU Regulation completed	- Agricultural pesticide regulation under revision; Environmental regulation in public consultation; Regulation for pesticides for public health being published	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	<p>- Targeted sampling for inspection is being implemented. An evaluation is planned in the fall of 2018 that includes results from the field as well;</p> <p>- Recruitment of an international consultant for pesticides analysis under way</p> <p>ONSSA has developed a website application to make the information publically available</p>	
	c) Information exchanged by compliance	No formal mechanism for exchange	Capacity building for personnel in charge of pesticide	Formal mechanism established; registration decisions		

	and enforcement institutions.	e.g. notification of new registrations	inspection and training on sampling and inspection.	shared		
Outcome 4: Reduced use of conventional chemical pesticides through promotion of alternatives	<p>a) % of network farmers using alternatives (e.g. IPM) and HHP/POPs</p> <p>b) Proxy for use of alternatives (TBD)</p>	<p>1. Export driven farmers expected to use alternatives but not small holders ; and vice versa for HHP/POPs (to be confirmed by planned baseline study)</p> <p>2. Several companies produce beneficial insects in Souss Massa</p>	N/A	50% increase in the baseline figure	<p>The typological study was initially suspended by the LTO/LTU since the pilot applied in another country proved to be unsatisfactory. An alternative was proposed including a stock-taking of alternatives and survey of current practices and problems.</p> <p>Development of a guide for good practices in citrus pest management, including the introduction of alternatives to conventional chemical control.</p> <p>Workshop on alternatives to conventional chemical control. Contacts being made with ASPAM, a professional association to organize a meeting on opportunities for collaboration in producer training on good practices for using alternatives to conventional chemical control.</p>	S

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: Risks to human health and the environment reduced through safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of pesticide-contaminated soil	Hire a consultant or consulting firm to assess 10 priority contaminated sites using FAO's Rapid Environmental Assessment (REA) approach	FAO-Morocco (FAO-MA) and Secrétariat d'Etat Chargé du Développement Durable (= Ministry of Environment)	December 2019
Outcome 2: Reduce health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their reuse	Carry out the benchmarking study that will be the basis for decision makers to decide on whether they want to pilot the valorization of empty containers while starting the process to adapt the legislation.	FAO-MA and Secrétariat d'Etat Chargé du développement Durable (= Ministry of Environment)	December 2019
Outcome 3. Institutional and technical capacities for registration and post-registration system are enhanced	Continue exploration for competent consultants, including national competencies	FAO-MA LOARC	December 2019

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

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
<i>Output 1.1 Safeguarding and disposal strategy in line with national and international best practice</i>	----	Environmental Assessment (EA) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP) developed and approved and disposal operations for obsolete pesticides authorized Awareness of the holders Inventory verification Update PSMS	Development of technical specifications and other tender related documents; Revision of intermediate collection center list as to conform to Governmental and FAO requirements; Revision of regulatory environment study;	Data updated and introduced in PSMS Tender documents developed and published	None		100 %	Output completed at the 3rd PIR

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

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

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

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

<i>Output 1.2 Safeguarding, export and destruction of inventoried waste completed in an environmenta lly sound manner</i>	Q1, 2020		N/A	Contract signed	-Veolia mission to Morocco for the steering committee meeting and technical meetings with relevant partners -Launch of the environmental impact assessment of the CCC (Central collection centers) -Importation of Protective Equipment. -Basel Convention: (2 notifications in progress UK and France). -Fieldwork plan on packaging and transport of empty pesticide packaging developed.		40%	On track: waiting for the authorization from the Bale convention to export, and for the results of the EIA of the two CCCs (Central collection centers). Procedure to facilitate import of PPE (Personal protective equipment) by Veolia has been accelerated
<i>Output 1.3 Contaminated sites remediated</i>	Q3, 2020		N/A	Development of ToR; Contact with International Consultant			10%	The agreement with the international association "Pure Earth" has not been successful. A new strategy based on a recruitment of a consultant has been agreed upon. Recruitment process has started.
<i>Output 2.1. Container management pilot implemented in Sous Massa</i>	Q4, 2020	Programme prepared and shared with pesticide companies	Consultations with key stakeholders (farmers, local administration , etc				70%	Benchmarking study requested by the Government for decision making on implementation of strategy for container management (see 2.2.). First of all, a solution to the classification of empty pesticide containers and regulations must be found

Output 2.2. <i>National strategy for container management</i>	Q4, 2019	1st draft developed and shared	Consultation with stake holders		- ToR for a benchmarking study on the management of empty pesticide containers (EPC) in 5 countries (France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, UK) developed and agreed upon. The study will examine the regulatory framework and the technical and economic feasibility of existing valorization chains -Protocol for carrying out analysis of pesticide residues in empty containers after triple rinsing with running water.	25%	Issues with waste regulation that considers EPC as dangerous waste even when triple rinsed, still persist. The benchmark study will assist decision makers to identify a way forward for Morocco.
Output 3.1. Pesticide management legislation and registration system revised and improved in conformity with the Code and EU regulations	----	Regulatory texts are being updated for all life cycle of pesticides (twin project ONSSA/EU and other projects	ONSSA published part of texts, MoE published biocide law and MoH published pesticide law	ONSSA initiated introduction of GHS in pesticides regulation	Training on the GHS Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals for Executives in charge of the Registration of Pesticides in the Ministries concerned.	90%	Publishing new text is a lengthy process
Output 3.2 Pilot pesticide import control system	----	No activity	No operational activity – preparation /expert	Training and development of tools and guiding documents	-Establishment of the state of play of the control of the distribution of pesticides for agricultural use and	100 %	N/A

implemented at Casablanca port			identification		fertilizing materials. -Proposal of an inspection method for the distribution of these products. -Training workshop on the control of the distribution of pesticides for agricultural use, fertilizers and culture support.			
Output 3.3 Chemical Analysis and Research Laboratory (LOARC) analytical capacity enhanced	Q1, 2020	N/A	No operational activity – preparation /expert identification	No operational activity – preparation /expert identification	ToRs on analysis of formulations and active ingredients of pesticides in accordance with national and international standards, prepared to accompany LOARC for the control of pesticide formulations.		20%	Issues with availability of experts: The recruitment of an international chemist specialized in this field did not succeed.
Output 3.4 Mechanism for information exchange on pesticide quality and food safety established	Q2, 2018	N/A	No operational activity – preparation /expert identification	ONSSA built its own application and made information available on its site				N/A
Output 4.1. Typology study conducted and alternatives identified in Sousse Massa	Q1, 2020	Change from typological study to stock-taking and survey and establish best practice initiative The study will	ToR for consultant developed methodological approach have been prepared	Consultant recruited	Consultant recruited with some modifications in comparison with the first ToRs (addition of FFS and training of trainers (4.2))		20%	The first recruitment of consultant did not follow

		allow to gather field data on alternatives already used and whether they need improvement or not.						
Output4.2 Alternatives promoted to farmers and extension service providers	Q3, 2020	N/A	N/A	Contacts with ASPAM for an LOA for field operations			N/A	Contact (LOA) with ASPAM did not succeed. Material for promotion of IPM in Citrus for use in training of trainers for the national extension institutions.

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:

- Despite delays in completing the tender due to the complexity of the project and Moroccan regulatory context, Component 1 is now on track. Indeed, the FAO, the company in charge of disposal operations and the Moroccan government are working together to achieve the expected results.
- The goal of decontamination / remediation of sites has changed compared to the original project document. The 10 main sites were well identified, but the possibility of decontaminating 10 was reduced to 1 site. These operations are long and costly, so the planned objectives will not be achievable. However, it is possible to have one site decontaminated and use it as a case study and a transfer of competence.
- Trainings were conducted in two regions on awareness of the rinsing of empty pesticide packaging and their potential hazards (Component 2). However, the management of these packaging is non-existent and cannot be developed as long as the problem related to the legislation remains. The idea is to continue training and provide decision makers with a benchmark study on how 5 countries have managed their EPC technically and legally as well as a demonstration of the residual pesticides contained in empty containers having been triple rinsed. After having lagged behind, the component 4 on alternatives to pesticides has now started on a positive note.

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

Max 200 words:

1. Lack of experts available in highly specialized fields such as pesticide formulation analysis, review and evaluation;
2. Unlike other countries, regulation by Ministry of Environment of the Kingdom of Morocco considers triple rinsing not enough to allow EPC manipulation. This hinders the implementation of pilot project on valorisation of EPC;
3. Lack of clearly defined procedures to facilitate the import of protection equipment by the Kingdom of Morocco.
4. Delay in government responses to validate some activities.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	Progress has been overall satisfactory and the project will be meeting its objectives despite its difficult start. The work of component 1 on safeguarding and disposal of obsolete pesticides is in progress. Now, the priority is given to the second component on the pilot project implementation for EPC The other components are currently underway.
Budget Holder	S	S	Despite the difficulties encountered due to the complexity of the project and the Moroccan legal context, the main partners, i.e. the Ministry of Agriculture, marine Fisheries, Rural Development and Water and Forests, the State Secretariat for Sustainable Development, the company Veolia SP and FAO, are working hand in hand to make the maximum impact of this project
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	S	S	Improvements have been made in project implementation and all components are moving towards meeting the project objectives.

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

Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

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

<p>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</p>	<p>MS</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Most of the GEBs will be met, and even though some of the targets for important progress indicators will not be met, the project is working on an enabling environment in order to facilitate uptake and upscaling of successes. For this, the planned demonstration activities will not be sufficient, but they will need to be accompanied by conducive policy environment, committed institutions and sufficient budgets. It is not clear whether the project has been able to achieve all of this and therefore is planning an exit to the project that will allow for multiplication (needed to achieve the originally planned GEBs, but also replicate).</p> <p>The project management has been satisfactory, and is successfully fed by an inter-ministerial technical committee, which meets monthly. Challenges are numerous, and the project management team has been adapting agendas, approaches, and more to the changing environment. Focusing on the larger components of the project, though, the work on integrated pest management has been benefiting from less attention, which could potentially lead to insufficient time to consolidate, learn from field work and feed back into planning.</p>
---	------------------	-----------------	---

Environmental and Social Safeguards

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Risk Classification B	Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid Potential for environmental impairment particularly in the event of an accident in the removal, transport and elimination of the obsolete pesticides

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.

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

3. Risks

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE

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

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Institutional arrangements pose challenges related to execution of the project	L	N/A	N/A	
2	Potential for instability	L	N/A	N/A	
3	Environmental contamination from leakage of POPs and other obsolete pesticides due to poor conditions of containers.	M	It depends on the sites Stop work and clean the leak with intervention equipment	N/A	

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

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

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Monitoring Staff being exposed to pesticides during collection and repacking of empty containers.	L to M	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Priority to vulnerable sites to be secured first; 2. Training of employees and project team according to a national regulation for labor and to FAO standards limiting exposure to a minimum ; 3. Facilitation by Government 	FAO hired an international company competent and has track record of safe securing pesticides	
5	Insufficient funds for safeguarding of major contaminated sites, the disposal of POPs and other project activities	M	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 not done yet and Elimination did not begin	
6	Insufficient national capacity in undertaking evaluation and decontamination of pesticide contaminated sites	H	Trainings by project experts and Véolia on safeguarding activities are planned, anticipating the risk of capacity gaps.	Training will be provided before the safeguarding activities start.	
7	Climate risks such as floods, crop calendars disruption or increase of pest invasions	M	Train new staff on emergency response anticipate a flood risk assessment for collection centers obtain regional agrometeorological information	N/A	
8	Low existing use and uptake of alternative technologies by producers.	L	<p>Farmers' awareness, in collaboration with the producer organizations</p> <p>Recruitment of an national consultant who will determine alternatives to pesticides for citrus fruits</p> <p>FFS are planned according to the needs of Minagri</p>	Development of a guide on alternatives for citrus fruits and organization of awareness day and FFS for farmers	

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
9	Poisonings among the agents involved in the collection and re-grouping of un-rinsed empty pesticide containers.	M	Train employees	planned before starting the safeguarding activities	
10	Pesticide companies/ distributors and farmers do not support the project	L	The necessary advocacy actions will be undertaken in the context of the project communication strategy		
11	Customs non-compliance during the implementation of the new pesticides control system at entry points.	L	Custom authorities are supportive of the project	Customs support project and implementation of import control system	

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
M	M	No change compared to 2018

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

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

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	No	

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: 30-Nov-2018 Revised NTE: 30-Nov-2020</p> <p><u>Justification:</u> Delay in awarding the contract for the elimination of obsolete pesticides and complexity of the Moroccan context (very high number of contaminated sites and need for intermediary sites).</p>

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

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)?

In general, in the project, women's participation is represented by two aspects: participating in activities as direct or indirect beneficiaries, or partaking in the project management directly.

Unfortunately, the implementation of the project did not result in managers' sufficient commitment to involve women sufficiently in the key results of the project, especially in field activities for farmers. For this training, women's participation does not exceed 20%.

However, the involvement of women in the project activities was through the technical training given on empty containers management and the regulatory aspects. Indeed, when activities are for administration employees, equality is considered, and when it is for growers, the less women participate.

This difference can be explained by the choice of target audience (higher social and education level) and the difficulty of mobilizing women outside urban areas.

The limited participation of women should be corrected through implementing specific activities for women and children as the most vulnerable to pesticide effects. These are the most exposed to pesticide residues as the empty containers are reused to store water for multiple household purposes for example or by collecting water which is typically the work of women and girls in rural areas that are not provided with water system. Indeed, training has been organized on the impact of pesticides and their empty containers on human health and the exposure of vulnerable groups, including rural women and girls, to the benefit of the personnel of FAO, UN Women and other UN agencies. In addition, during the SIAM, sessions of the same training were duplicated for farmers and children. The project team plan to organize training and activities for women and children only on the danger of pesticides to give equal opportunity to women and vulnerable people.

Also, the project management units are made of women, therefore all management decisions involve women.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

N/A

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

List of all stakeholders engaged in the project:

- Government (Project initiation and all PMU meetings) :
 - Ministry of Agriculture
 - State Secretary in charge of Sustainable Development (ex. MoE)
 - Ministry of Interior
 - Ministry of Health
- International NGO (Project initiation and all PMU meetings) :
 - Crop Life International and CropLife Morocco
- Association and NGO (contributed in organizing training):
 - ASPAM
 - ALBRA

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

The project aims to eliminate stockpiles of obsolete pesticides inventory, including persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and derivatives waste, and to develop a program to prevent further accumulation of stocks in Morocco, through training and capacity building. The securing and eliminating obsolete pesticides was entrusted to a highly specialised International Company.

Otherwise, an action plan for managing pesticide empty containers was developed and some training for family farmers on management of pesticide empty containers (PEC) was done.

Also, a study on alternatives with family farmers is planned to develop a program for alternatives to pesticide use and guide on best practices focusing on alternatives to conventional chemical control. In order to share this information, FFS and awareness days are scheduled.

Two guides for pesticide control and inspections at import and at distribution are developed and organization of two training of pesticides import and distribution inspection officers is planned.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	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
National Government	Office National de la Sécurité Sanitaire des produits Alimentaires (ONSSA)	Grant	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
National Government	ONSSA	In kind	8,300,000	5,078,220	2,841,900	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	9,000,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
Private sector	CropLife International	Grant	1,814,500	1,814,500	1,814,500	1,814,500
Private sector	CropLife International	In kind	1,005,000	920,000	920,000	1,005,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	1,277,126			1,277,126
TOTAL			24,246,626	9,712,720	7,476,400	16,146,626

²² 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.

