



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).....	14
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	16
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	21
6. RISKS	23
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION	27
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	29
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	30
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	32
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	34
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	37
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	38

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Burkina Faso, Chad, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger and Senegal
Project Title:	Disposal of Obsolete Pesticides Including POPs and Strengthening Pesticide Management of The Comité Permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte Contre la Secheresse dans le Sahel (CILSS) Member States (FSP)
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/INT/147/GFF
GEF ID:	4740
GEF Focal Area(s):	Chemicals and Waste
Project Executing Partners:	CILSS Executive Secretariat and its technical and administrative branches, ECOWAS, UEMOA and Ministries of Agriculture
Initial project duration (years):	4 years
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> a) Projects with 1st PIR; b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.	NA

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	22 December 2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	1 April 2015
Project Implementation End Date/NTE²:	31 March 2019
Revised project implementation end date (if approved) ¹	31 December 2023

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	7,450,000 USD
Total Co-financing amount (USD)²:	30,766,300USD
Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	5,766,259 USD
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)³:	5,457,387 USD
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁴	17,267,764 USD

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	25 February 2023
---	------------------

¹ If NTE extension has been requested and approved by the FAO-GEF CU.

² This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO Document/Project Document.

³ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

⁴ Please refer to the Section 13 of this report where updated co-financing estimates are requested and indicate the total co-financing amount materialized.

Expected Mid-term Review date⁵:	24 Jun – 14 July 2019
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	24 Jun – 14 July 2019
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁶:	30 December 2023 – process to be initiated.
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	NA

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	Moderate
---	----------

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator (PC)	Antoine Namwinyoh SOME	Antoine.Some@fao.org
Budget Holder (BH)	Gouantoueu Robert Guei	Gouantoueu.Guei@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Gu Baogen	Baogen.Gu@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer	Kuena Morebotsane	Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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 ⁷	Baseline	Mid-term Target Mid-term Target ⁸	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ⁹ since project start Level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹⁰
To reduce risk to public health and the environment from POPs and hazardous pesticide waste and contaminated materials.	Outcome 1: Identified risks from existing obsolete stocks eliminated and risk from heavily pesticide-contaminated sites reduced.	a) Approximately 850 tonnes of POPs and other obsolete pesticides disposed of by the end of the project	567 tonnes of obsolete pesticides and associated waste have been inventoried in Burkina Faso, Niger, Chad, Mauritania and Senegal	Implementation of risk reduction strategy for obsolete stock started.	All safeguarded pesticides destroyed.	Inventory, centralization and securing of more than 1575 tons of obsolete pesticides and associated waste in 8 countries. Document of regional strategy for obsolete pesticide centralization, safeguarding and disposal adopted by regional meeting (300 participants: 28-30 September 2021) Adoption of Environmental Assessment (EA) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for 8 countries by regional meeting (28-30 September 2021)	S

⁷ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project.

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

¹⁰ 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>The project disposal tender was published on 21/2/2023 and the process is ongoing.</p> <p>It is envisaged that Up to 502 metric tons of POPs pesticides and other obsolete pesticides will be safely destroyed in an environmentally sound manner in by the end of 2023.</p>	
		b) 8 highly contaminated sites remediated and risks reduced by at least 50% (decline in contaminants in soil).	Eight heavily pesticides contaminated sites have been identified in Burkina Faso (3), Mauritania, (1) Niger (1) & Senegal (3).	Risk reduction strategy for contaminated sites developed and approved in each country.	Remediation completed in all 8 sites.	<p>Adjustment made to remediate 2 sites in Mauritania and 1 site in Senegal.</p> <p>Application of Rapid Environmental Assessment (REA) tools and site investigation techniques in polluted sites (Senegal and Mauritania)</p> <p>Development of remediation/risk reduction plans adopted by national experts</p> <p>Implementation of remediation/risk reduction plans in Senegal (Direction du Développement Rural (DRDR) de Louga) and Mauritania (Magasin d'AELP et site de site de Letfetar).</p> <p>Remediation/risk successfully implemented at all sites (2 sites in Mauritania).</p>	MS
	Outcome 2: Risks to the environment and human health from empty pesticide containers used in	a) Container management programmes operational in four countries (Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali and Senegal).	A pilot container management programme in the cotton production areas in seven communes in	Critical review of pilot programme in Mali and strategy developed for scaling up. Assessment of container	Existing pilot programme in Mali scaled up Pilot programmes in Burkina Faso, Chad and	<p>The pilot scheme for the management of empty pesticide packaging in Mali is positively evaluated and recommended for its expansion to other areas of Mali.</p> <p>An expansion scheme for empty pesticide packaging in Mali validated and adopted.</p>	MS

	cotton production reduced		Mali. None in the other countries	management in the three other countries	Senegal operational and a regional container management strategy designed	Strategy to extend the pilot scheme to the other three countries (Burkina Faso, Senegal and Chad), with a system of disposal at the regional level, validated and adopted (June 2018)	
		b) 90% of empty containers triple rinsed in cotton production areas covered by the container management programmes in Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, and Senegal	Approximately 3,565,000 empty containers generated in the cotton production areas of Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali and Senegal About 100,745 empty containers are collected annually and of which 77,000 are secured and 25, 000 are triple rinsed in Mali.	Pilot container management programmes designed and approved in three countries. Existing pilot programme in Mali is scaled up.	Pilot programmes in Burkina Faso, Chad and Senegal operational and a regional container management strategy designed	Adoption of an "Action Plan for Empty Pesticide Packaging Management in Burkina Faso, Senegal and Chad" through a regional workshop held in Dakar on July 24 and 25, 2020. Implementation of pilot programmes in Chad and Senegal. Involvement of several hundred producers on the development and the implementation of empty pesticides containers management systems in Senegal and Chad. Training, promotion of triple rinsing, puncturing the containers, first collection of containers by farmers in Chad and Senegal.	MS
		c) 40% of the containers entering the market for use in cotton in the target countries are recycled	In Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali and Senegal empty pesticides containers are	Pilot programme in Burkina Faso, Chad and Senegal operational.	Pilot programmes in Burkina Faso, Chad and Senegal operational and	Training of women in processing of empty containers into paving blocks for the yard in Senegal (20 -30 Jun 2021) Processing of empty containers into paving blocks for the yard in Senegal	MS

			not collected in the cotton production areas		a regional container management strategy designed	Contract under negotiation with NGOs and private companies (SOTRADA) for the transformation or disposal of plastic packaging in Chad.	
	Outcome 3: Regulatory framework and institutional capacity for sound management of pesticides throughout their lifecycle strengthened	a) Revised registration system adopted by CILSS, ECOWAS and UEMOA and the countries. Regional regulation and revised national legislations enabling the regional harmonized system enacted or undergoing enactment by the end of the project	A draft CILSS-ECOWAS-UEMOA harmonized instrument for registration and management of pesticides in Western Africa was developed in 2012. National pesticides legislation exists but do not currently support regional harmonization of post registration activities including inspections at import and throughout national pesticides supply channels	Harmonized registration system submitted for adoption by the three regional bodies, CILSS, ECOWAS and UEMOA and by CILSS countries	Harmonized regional regulation undergoing adoption by regional bodies and countries Revised draft legislations completed and undergoing adoption process in each country	Common registration adopted (Study of strengths and weaknesses of the ECOWAS regulation C / Reg.3 / 05/2008 and proposal for implementing texts completed with the support of the project) Development of six harmonized tools for pesticides registration and management under COAHP: a) four applications for registration of pesticides from COAHP; b) a manual for pesticide inspection and control; c) a procedure manual for processing COAHP pesticide registration documents. (Documents available) Establishment and Functioning of the West African Pesticides Committee (WAPRC) (kick-off meeting of the WAPRC. This meeting took place from March 21st to 25th, 2022 in Niamey (Niger)	MS

		<p>b) National Pesticide Management Committees (NPMC/CNGPs) operational with work plan and approved budget. National systems for inspection and quality control of pesticides in all nine project countries</p>	<p>NPMCs were created in all project countries (except Guinea Bissau) in 2002. NPMC Mali is the only operational. No proper functioning inspection and quality control systems in the countries</p>	<p>NPMCs are operational in all project countries.</p>	<p>NPMCs are operational in all project countries.</p> <p>Regional and national systems for inspection and quality control of pesticides operational in 9 participating countries</p> <p>Registration of bio-pesticides underway</p>	<p>NPMCs are operational in all project countries.</p> <p>NPMCs of Benin and Côte d'Ivoire are implemented with the financial support of WAEMU (co-financing) And Guinea with INSAH's own funding.</p> <p>Training of trainers in the use of "NPMC" modules and the "Public" module of IPMSWA/SIGEPAO (Integrated Pesticide Management System in West Africa), in Lomé from 2 to 4 October 2019; 51 participants from the 17 States in CILSS-ECOWAS-UEMOA areas.</p> <p>Training in inspection and quality control.</p> <p>Biopesticide registration applications are submitted.</p> <p>Studies for up-grading of Laboratory to perform appropriate quality control analysis and initiate its accreditation to ISO 17025 (on going with the recruitment international consultant)</p>	MS
		<p>% reduction in the number of hazardous conventional chemical pesticide registrations and increase in the number of registered bio-pesticides</p>	<p>208 chemical Pesticides Currently registered and 5 bio-pesticides registered in CILSS countries</p>	<p>List of most Promising Alternatives to highly hazardous chemical pesticides for the control of key pests finalized and field experiments</p>	<p>% reduction in the number of hazardous conventional chemical pesticide registrations and increase in the number of registered bio-pesticides.</p>	<p>Priority zones and producers - cotton-growing areas - in the 3 countries (Burkina-Faso, Mali, Senegal) identified.</p> <p>Characterization of farm structure in cotton-growing areas of Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal completed.</p> <p>Establishment of a representative network for farmers (Burkina, Senegal and Mali).</p>	S

				<p>conducted.</p> <p>Registration of bio-pesticides underway</p> <p>Typology studies completed and representative farmer networks established.</p>		<p>41 identified alternatives to be tested in Station (farm field) and CEP (Farmer Field Schools) in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal</p> <p>Testing of alternative products on vegetable crops, corn and cotton in Burkina-Faso, Mali and Senegal.</p> <p>Development of "Regional action plan for promoting integrated management of alternatives" (validated by a regional workshop held in Dakar on January 28 and 29, 2020);</p> <p>Implementation of FFS in Burkina Faso (10 FFS, crops: cabbage and tomato; 195 farmers trained including 35% of women) Mali (10FFS, crops: cabbage and tomato; 253 farmers including 92% of women) Senegal (7 FFS, crops: pepper an eggplant; 173 farmers trained including 92% of women) Mali and Burkina Faso</p> <p>Updating the training curriculum for Farmers' Field Schools to include the most promising integrated management alternatives</p> <p>Establishment of Farmers' Field Schools in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal. Program implementation, in the three countries, was carried out from December 2018 to April 2019 for market garden crops and from July to November 2019 for cotton and maize</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<p>Assessment of producers' accessibility to alternative products to dangerous synthetic chemical pesticides in Burkina-Faso, Mali and Senegal (market study);</p> <p>Value chain assessment (import, local production, distribution, availability for farmers) of selected alternatives.</p> <p>Production of technical manuals on preventive alternative solutions and curative alternative solutions.</p> <p>Information awareness raising for institutions and communities. Two workshops were organized in Senegal (from September 30 to October 2, 2020) and in Mali (from October 12 to 14, 2020). The two gender-specific information / awareness workshops and training were grouped together in each country. The workshops were attended by about thirty participants including six (6) women in Mali and 26 actors including 7 women in Senegal.</p>	
	<p>Outcome 4: IPM practices successfully promoted and the use of POPs and highly hazardous pesticides phased out or reduced</p>	<p>Changes in use patterns of highly hazardous pesticides and IPM alternatives: % reduction in annual quantity of Highly Hazardous Pesticides used</p>	<p>Baseline to be established in year 1. Baseline Knowledge Attitudes and Practices (KAP) survey to be</p>	<p>Endorsed regional strategy for the promotion of alternatives. Farmer Field Schools sessions on identified IPM alternatives</p>	<p>% reduction in annual quantity of Highly Hazardous Pesticides used and % increase in use of IPM alternatives</p>	<p>Implementation of FFS in Burkina Faso (10 FFS, crops : cabbage and tomato; 195 farmers trained including 35% of women) Mali (10FFS, crops: cabbage and tomato; 253 farmers including 92% of women) Senegal (7 FFS, crops: pepper an eggplant; 173 farmers trained including 92% of women) Mali and Burkina Faso</p>	<p>S</p>

		and % increase in use of IPM alternatives Behavioural change at farmer level	completed in year	in cotton-systems (includes vegetables and cereals) in Senegal, Mali and Burkina Faso underway.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updating the training curriculum for Farmers' Field Schools to include the most promising integrated management alternatives - Establishment of Farmers' Field Schools in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal. - Assessment of producers' accessibility to alternative products of dangerous synthetic chemical pesticides in Burkina-Faso, Mali and Senegal (market study); 	
	Outcome 5: Management Monitoring Evaluation	Quality and timely project reports	Project Results Matrix with outcome and output indicators and targets.		Eighty six-monthly progress reports. Four Annual project Implementation review reports	Regular reports on the progress of the project are submitted Participation in steering committee and presentation of activity reports and programs (5) Seven annual project implementation review are transmitted to the GEF	S
		Midterm and final evaluation reports			Two evaluations Conducted.	Mid-term evaluation completed (24 Jun to 14 July 2019 in the field) Final evaluation is at the last semester 2023	S
		Project "best-practices" and "lessons-learned" disseminated via publications, project website and others			Frequently updated website Newsletter Publications in the in scientific journal and FAO website	Production of technical manuals on preventive alternative solutions and curative alternative solutions Several documents on Environmental Assessment (EA) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for each country and rapid Environmental Assessment (RAE) for Senegal and Mauritania 10 newsletters edited and distributed to raise the visibility of the project (more than 850 subscribers)	S

						<p>Production of two video films on the results and achievements of the project. (These films were broadcast on several television channels in Africa, Europe and Canada)</p> <p>One publication on the Global FFS Platform: <i>"Use of alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides through Farmer Field Schools in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal"</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1: b) 8 highly contaminated sites remediated and risks reduced by at least 50% (decline in contaminants in soil).	Adjustment was made to remediate sites in Senegal and Mauritania (3 sites in total) until October 2022. The team will work closely together with a national department (DPV in Senegal) to close this activity	National expert/CTA/DPV	December 2023. Activities are underway
Outcome 2: b) 90% of empty containers triple rinsed in cotton production areas covered by the container management programmes in Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, and Senegal	The team will work closely with national experts to carry out the container management micro-projects in Senegal and Chad (2 countries with 4 sites) until December 2023.	National expert/CTA/NGOs	December 2023. Activities are underway

Outcome 2: c)40% of the containers entering the market for use in cotton in the target countries are recycled	The team will work closely with private sector or NGO's to monitor the micro-project activities in Senegal and Chad. Contract under negotiation with NGOs (women association in Senegal) and private companies (SOTRADA in Chad) for the transformation or disposal of plastic packaging Contract under negotiation with NGOs and private companies (SOTRADA) for the transformation or disposal of plastic packaging in Chad.	National expert/CTA/NGOs	December 2023. Activities are underway
Outcome 3: b) National Pesticide Management Committees (NPMC/CNGPs) operational with work plan and approved budget. National systems for inspection and quality control of pesticides in all nine project countries	Up-grading of the selected Laboratory to perform appropriate quality control analysis and initiate its accreditation to ISO 17025 and the Evaluation of the analytical capacities of the upgraded Laboratories will be done by the team during the second semester of 2023 with the international consultant There was a long delay in recruiting the consultant The team will work closely together with the international consultant to monitor this activity	LTO/CTA/BH/IC	December 2023. Activities are underway

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹¹	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹² (please DO NOT repeat results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹³ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1.: Identified risks from existing obsolete stocks eliminated and risk from heavily pesticide-contaminated sites reduced				
Output 1.2: Up to 850 metric tons of POPs pesticides and other obsolete pesticides safely destroyed in an environmentally sound manner	All safeguarded pesticides destroyed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preparation of the International Bidding Document with the contribution of a consultant - Launch of the international call for tenders by FAO to recruit obsolete pesticides disposal companies for the second quarter of 2021; - Guided tours of the sites by organized disposal companies, with the involvement of national experts and FAORs (for the second quarter); - Receipt of bids and evaluation of bids (for the second quarter); - Contracting with national stakeholders (Plant Protection Department, National Locust Control Agency) for monitoring operations; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Launch of the international call for tenders by FAO to recruit obsolete pesticides disposal companies - Receipt of more than 20 substantial clarification questions/points to answer to the bidders in order for them to submit valuable proposals. - Receipt of bids and evaluation of bids (on going) 	<u>Not completed:</u> delay in the selection and Signature of the contract (s) (for 2023)

¹¹ Outputs as described in the project Logframe or in any approved project revision.

¹² 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)

¹³ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

		- Selection and Signature of the contract (s) (for 2022).		
<u>Output 1.3:</u> Risks from eight highly contaminated sites quantified, remediation strategies developed and implemented.	Remediation completed in all 8 sites.	Implementation of remediation / risk reduction plans will begin in Mauritania and Senegal	The remediation plan was implemented in Mauritania (2 sites) and Senegal (1 site)	<u>Not completed:</u> there was a long delay in the procurement of equipment to be delivered to the DPV
Outcome 2: Risks to the environment and human health from empty pesticide containers used in cotton production reduced				
<u>Output 2.2:</u> Containers management systems piloted in cotton producing areas in three project countries (Burkina Faso, Chad and Senegal)	Pilot programme in Burkina Faso, Chad and Senegal operational.	micro-project for the Management of Empty Pesticide Packaging operational	Implementation of the micro-project in Chad and Senegal	<u>Not completed:</u> Chad: No formal contract yet. However, some waste is burned.
Outcome 3: Regulatory framework and institutional capacity for sound management of pesticides throughout their lifecycle strengthened.				
<u>Output 3.4</u> Regional analytical services and quality control of pesticides strengthened to serve nine participating countries	Upgraded Laboratories with samples analysed in conformance to ISO 17025.	Preliminary assessment of analytical laboratory capacities for the quality control of pesticides has been done.	Assessment of analytical laboratories capacity Lab upgraded and its accreditation to ISO 17025 initiated.	Not completed: Delay in recruitment of international consultant. The project team is working on this output
Outcome 5: Management Monitoring and Evaluation				
<u>Output 5.1:</u> Project monitoring system providing six-monthly reports on progress in achieving project outputs and outcomes	Quality and timely project reports.	PIR 2023 writing	Annual Project implementation Review	Attendance to ECOWAS Steering Committee of Projects and program and presentation of project results. (20 February – 3 March, 2023)

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)

Outcome 1 - Identified risks from existing obsolete stocks eliminated and risk from heavily pesticide-contaminated sites reduced

- Adoption of the regional strategy document for obsolete pesticide centralization, safeguarding and disposal by regional workshop
- Adoption of Environmental Studies and Environmental Management plans for 8 countries of project by regional workshop
- Carried out Rapid Environmental Assessment (REA) for contaminated sites in Senegal and Mauritania and Implementation of remediation/risk reduction plans in Senegal (Direction du Développement Rural (DRDR) de Louga) and Mauritania (Magasin d'AELP et site de site de Letfetar) with good results.
- Finalization of tender documents for submission to procurement,
- Review of obsolete stocks of CropLife International to incorporate these stocks in the stocks of the project – with CLI funds.
- Challenge: There will remain more than 1000 tons of obsolete pesticides centralized, due to insufficient funds to complete the disposal.
- Positive environmental impact

Outcome 2 - Risks to the environment and human health from empty pesticide containers used in cotton production reduced

- **Senegal:** Implementing a micro project for the management of empty pesticide containers (EPC) in the cotton sector of Missirah and the Union maraîchère in Noto. Training of women's groups for the transformation of EPC into paving blocks. The challenge is to provide women with the necessary equipment to make the paving stones.
- **Chad:** Micro-project for the Management of Empty Pesticide Packaging in the cotton sector of MOUNDOU and Market Garden Union called (Union de maraîchère de la Province de HADJER LEMIS) underway. The challenge is the signing of an agreement for the treatment and processing of empty packaging by the company SOTRADA
- Involvement of several hundred producers, positive environmental impact, training and scaling up possible in other countries, contract under negotiation with NGOs and private companies for the transformation of plastic packaging.
-

Outcome 3 - Regulatory framework and institutional capacity for sound management of pesticides throughout their lifecycle strengthened

- Common registration adopted (Study of strengths and weaknesses of the ECOWAS regulation C / Reg.3 / 05/2008 and proposal for implementing texts completed with the support of the project)
- Six tools for harmonization of pesticides registration and management under WAPRC: a) four applications for registration of pesticides from WAPRC; b) a manual for pesticide inspection and control; c) a procedure manual for processing WAPRC pesticide registration documents.
- Establishment and Functioning of the West African Pesticides Regional Committee (WAPRC) (kick-off meeting of the WAPRC February 2022)
- National Pesticide Management Committees (NPMCs) are implemented and are operational in all project countries and some countries of the region (Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Togo)
- The major challenge is to catch up on the delay in the study for the laboratories upgrading and funding for operations of WAPRC and NCPMs in the countries

Outcome 4: IPM practices successfully promoted and the use of POPs and highly hazardous pesticides phased out or reduced

- 41 identified alternatives and testing of alternative products on crops in Station (farm field) and CEP (Farmer Field Schools) in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal
- Development of "Regional action plan for promoting integrated management of alternatives" and validated.
- Implementation of FFS in Burkina Faso (10 FFS, crops : cabbage and tomato; 195 farmers trained including 35% of women) Mali (10FFS, crops: cabbage and tomato; 253 farmers including 92% of women) Senegal (7 FFS, crops: pepper an eggplant; 173 farmers trained including 92% of women) Mali and Burkina Faso
- Updating the training curriculum for Farmers' Field Schools to include the most promising integrated management alternatives
- Establishment of Farmers' Field Schools in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal. Program implementation, in the three countries, was carried out from December 2018 to April 2019 for market garden crops and from July to November 2019 for cotton and maize
- Assessment of producers' accessibility to alternative products to dangerous synthetic chemical pesticides in Burkina-Faso, Mali and Senegal (market study);
- Value chain assessment (import, local production, distribution, availability for farmers) of selected alternatives.
- Production of technical manuals on preventive alternative solutions and curative alternative solutions.
- The challenge: find funding to continue testing and support of the FFS
- More than 2000 farmers have been involved in this program in Mali, Senegal and Burkina Faso

Outcome 5: Monitoring and Evaluation

- Steering Committee meeting held in February 2023. This meeting was attended by participants and representatives of sub-regional institutions (CILSS, CEDEAO, UEMOA) and countries.
- Production of technical manuals on preventive alternative solutions and curative alternative solutions
- Environmental Assessment (EA) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for each country and rapid Environmental Assessment (RAE) for Senegal and Mauritania
- 10 newsletters edited and distributed to raise the visibility of the project (more than 850 subscribers)
- Production of two video films on the results and achievements of the project. (These films were broadcast on several television channels in Africa, Europe and Canada)
- One publication on the Global FFS Platform: *"Use of alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides through Farmer Field Schools in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal"*

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.

	FY2023 Development Objective rating¹⁴	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁵	Comments/reasons¹⁶ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	<p>With the extension of the project positive results were achieved under all components. All the activities programmed in the workplan 2022-2023 should be completed by December 2023 with the final evaluation (not yet scheduled). Most of activities planned in the ProDoc will be closed in the forthcoming months (end of December 2023).</p> <p>There will remain: i) Up-grading of the selected Laboratories to perform appropriate quality control analysis and initiate its accreditation to ISO 17025 and the Evaluation of the analytical capacities of the upgraded Laboratory (last semester of 2023). The project is still waiting for the recruitment of the international consultant i ii) disposal of 502 tonnes of obsolete pesticide in Europe. The tender is now at the stage of Evaluation. The tender is very unique and it requires time to assess the bids. When the bidders provide the work plan a realistic deadline for the safeguarding and disposal operations will be established.</p> <p>The project may need to be extended for approximately 6 months. A coordination by the project task force needs to be functional until Jun 2024 for the completion of activities on disposal and up-grading selected laboratories and the finalisation of the various reports, the final evaluation will be scheduled as soon as we have the bidders' feedback.</p>
Budget Holder	S	S	<p>The BH acknowledges the GEF for the extension of this project. The efforts of the team to catch up initial delays and to achieve the global objectives of this project are well appreciated. All of the expected outputs and adjusted by the Steering Committee and the MTR have been achieved and the results are encouraging for the future. The project achieved the most initially expected outcomes. The different steering committee are very satisfied with the work done and congratulated the project team.</p>

¹⁴ **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.

¹⁵ **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.

¹⁶ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

			<p>The project could be completed with the disposal of 502 tonnes in Europe and the up-grading of the selected Laboratory over the next few months. These two expected results are being closely monitored by BH.</p> <p>Technical studies on co-treatment options in cement companies seem to be a good opportunity for sustainable management of obsolete pesticides in the region. We will explore these solutions with the sub-regional institutions (ECOWAS, CILSS, UEMOA) and our partners including GEF. The issue of HHPs and PSMS is of great concern. All these issues will be submitted to the GEF-8. A small supervision should be maintained at the sub-regional office level to ensure regional involvement during the phase-out.</p>
GEF Operational Focal Point (Cabo Verde)	S	S	<p>We are satisfied with the results achieved by the Project both at the national and regional levels, as well as with the engagement of the different institutions and partners involved in the Project. The extension of the Project makes a decisive contribution to these results. We also welcome the good capacity to integrate the gender dimension into the Project. This integration has allowed the most vulnerable people to be effectively protected from exposure to pesticides.</p> <p>Despite these good results, we are concerned about the delay in the requalification of laboratories and the elimination of obsolete pesticides that have already been collected in different countries. Therefore, we urge the project team to make every effort to ensure that these two important activities are carried out as quickly as possible.</p>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁷ (Senegal)	S	S	<p>With the extension, many efforts are made to achieve the planned activities.. I, in my capacity of GEF operational Focal Point of Senegal, recommend the extension of the project or planning another one in order to covert the huge amount of of obsolete pesticides (700 tonnes) in the different sites through the whole country. Better coordination with the GEF Operational Focal Point must be continued to resolve remaining difficulties encountered and capitalize on the lessons learned.</p>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁸	S	MS	<p>The disposal, the important component, seems cannot be finished timely. The team has received bidders proposals and workplans and all of them indicating that safeguarding and disposal activity would require around 13 month from the time of the signature of the contract. The team is working on evaluation of the bids and selection of a company to do the last disposal. A lot of efforts were done by the project team to speed up this activity, however procurement actions are not dependent on technical officers</p>

¹⁷ In case the GEF OFP didn't provide his/her comments, please explain the reason.

¹⁸ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

			Laboratory selection has not been done even after four years. Recruitment of consultant has lasted for long time. I proposed to tackle with the challenge in other approach. The challenge is to catch up on the delay in the study for the laboratories upgrading and funding for operations of WAPRC and NCPMs in the countries. It seems the project cannot completed on time (end of December 23)".
GEF Technical Officer	MS	MS	The project has less than six-months before its end date. However, one of the key results – disposal of obsolete pesticide stocks – has not been fully delivered yet. Every effort is to be made to complete this important sub-component.

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
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
	NA			
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
	NA			
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	NA			
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	NA			
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
	The project is following FAO's Environmental Management Tool Kits (EMTK) for the assessment, safeguarding, transportation and disposal of obsolete pesticides. Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) have been developed for safeguarding and disposal activities.			Project Team
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
	NA			

ESS 7: Decent Work				
	NA			
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
	NA			
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
	NA			
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				
	NA			

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 ¹⁹ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Risk Classification B	Yes. As planned, to mitigate these risks the project is following FAO's Environmental Management Tool Kits (EMTK) for the assessment, safeguarding, transportation, and disposal of obsolete pesticides. Environmental Management Plans (EMP) is developed for the safeguarding activities

<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>
No.

¹⁹ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification has changed, the ESM Unit (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 ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1 *	Larger than expected volumes of waste are found at each contaminated sites or additional sites are identified. This could mean that funds dedicated to the safeguarding of high-priority sites, and the disposal of POPs would be insufficient	L	Y	The steering committee recommended seeking additional funds from donors Negotiating of additional funds with GEF. Finding new partners for funding	CLI will contribute an additional 50 tons for disposal	Prioritization has been established. The risk is not only linked to the achievement of the objectives, but also political
2	Institutional arrangements pose challenges to project execution	L	N	The quadripartite convention on institutional provisions (FAO, ECOWAS, CILSS, WEAMU) should ensure better involvement of institutions such as ECOWAS, UEMOA and especially CILSS in the implementation of Project activities All partners were involved in the design of the proposed institutional arrangements. In case any	An agreement was reached and the coordination remained at FAO	INSAH (the Director General or a staff member) has participated in national workshops organized by the project team in 5 countries 5: Burkina Faso, Niger, Mauritania, Chad, Senegal)

²⁰ Risk ratings means a rating of 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 ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
				challenges arise during implementation, these will be brought to the attention of the Project Steering Committee to seek guidance and identify ways forward .		
3	Extreme weather conditions such as torrential rain and floods.	L-M	Y	Emergency sites will be safeguarded during the driest months (from November to May) with a view to reducing risks associated with torrential rainfall. Contingency plans, especially targeting removal of excess water accumulated in the holding areas, will be implemented in the event of torrential rains.	Contingency Plans have been put in place	Contingency plans, especially targeting removal of excess water accumulated in the holding areas, will be implemented in the event of torrential rains
4	Environmental contamination from leakage of POPs and other obsolete pesticides due to poor conditions of containers	M	Y	Management measures to be included in the EMP include field procedures to ensure no further leakage occurs during the project activities.	EMPs in place	Chemical stores will be ranked according to leakage risk at the beginning of the project, and will be safe-guarded as a matter of priority.
5	Technical staff being exposed to pesticides during collection and repacking of empty containers	L	Y	Training modules on collection techniques for the safe collection, repackaging and storage of wastes will be executed, and Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) provided for all personnel involved in container collection	Training was executed	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
6	Insufficient ownership of the drafted uniform regional regulation	L	Y	<p>All key institutions including the CILSS Executive Secretariat, ECOWAS, UEMOA and the national governments demonstrated excellent high level political support to the objectives of the project, which are in line with the objectives of the regional bodies and the countries.</p> <p>All partners were involved in the design of the proposed institutional arrangements. In case any challenges arise during implementation, these will be brought to the attention of the Project Steering Committee to seek guidance and identify ways forward .</p>	<p>Inception workshop was held</p> <p>Three steering committee meeting were held</p>	National and regional stakeholders have been consulted during project preparation and other preparatory activities. The development of a harmonized approach is at the region's request. Continued sensitization will be conducted during project execution including national training sessions, and regional consultations with CILSS, ECOWAS and UEMOA. Five steering committee meeting were held
7	Low uptake of alternative technologies by producers	L	Y	FFS was implemented in countries (Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal	Large-scale information through newsletter, films and FFS	<p>A large-scale information and awareness-raising campaign about the modes of application and effectiveness of the proposed alternatives was undertaken to help promote uptake of alternatives.</p> <p>Another strategy is to employ existing farmer field schools networks. The promotion of IPM</p>

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²⁰	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
						through FFS has been quite successful in previous related initiatives
8	Situation due to Covid-19	H	N	Recommended COVID-19 preventive measures such as social distancing, wearing masks, routine disinfecting were applied during project implementation	Preventive measures were effectively implemented	Teleworking, virtual conference

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
Moderate	Moderate	There have been no changes since 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>
Recommendation 1: Recommendation 1: Move the coordination of the project to the Sahel Institute in Bamako, in order to comply with the request of the steering committee - and thus promote the capitalization and subsequent transfer of the project's achievements to the CILSS	Rejected: This item will be discussed in a meeting, to be held just prior to or in conjunction with the next steering committee meeting with the GEF representative present. This demand has not been a requirement for several years now
Recommendation 2: to FAO - Project Coordination: To issue administrative acts to institutionalize the recruitment of national experts to their governments, for countries where this is not yet done, and to ensure their involvement in all components of the Project with the organization of meetings by video conference once a month.	Accepted. Done for Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger.
Recommendation 3: for project coordination Involve national experts in the development of the PTBAs in order to take into account the specificities of each country in the implementation of activities, particularly the extension of alternatives to chemical pesticides through a better targeting of geographical areas and beneficiaries	Accepted. Done. National experts were involved in the preparation of the reports in each country.
Recommendation 4: for the coordination of the project: To propose alternative measures concerning the authorization of delegation of power of the members of the Steering Committee, in case of impediment of the member by right.	Accepted. Done. A letter has been sent by the SRC to ECOWAS.

Recommendation 5: to FAO: The efficiency of the project would be enhanced by the reinstatement of the Pesticide Stocks Management System (PSMS) and increased collaboration with other national and regional events in promoting the project. Re-establish the FAO Pesticide Stocks Management System (PSMS), which is extremely useful for the region and all countries of the world to inventory, sustainably manage and prioritize pesticide stocks according to their risks	<p>Accepted: Reflections are being made in this direction and formal contacts will be undertaken with other colleagues (FAO Commission for the Control of the Desert Locust in the Western Region – CLCPRO). Not executed due to lack of funding. This activity will be taken into account in a second phase of the project</p>
Recommendation 7: for Project coordination: Promote the project by creating a framework for dialogue between the various components and by using the various events organized at the national and regional levels in the fields of agriculture, livestock, public health and the environment to present and promote the project's achievements	<p>Accepted. Contacts have been made with sub-regional institutions. We participate in the steering committees of ECOWAS projects and programs. We have produced two films that have been broadcast and many newsletters on the results of the project. But for the previous period it was difficult to follow-up on these because of the situation related to Covid-19.</p>
Recommendation 9: to project coordination: In terms of sustainability, the project would benefit from developing new sub-regional partnerships and pooling the region's resources. Develop partnerships with other sub-regional institutions (e.g., the FAO Commission for the Control of the Desert Locust in the Western Region - CLCPRO) and African universities recognized in the management of pesticides (e.g., University of Cape Town in South Africa).	<p>Contacts have been made for the development of another initiative on the same subject.</p>
Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize	<p>NO</p>

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 Guidelines²¹. 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	N/A		
Components and cost	N/A		
Institutional and implementation arrangements	N/A		
Financial management	N/A		
Implementation schedule	Extension of the project	New NTE: December 2023	Steering committee
Executing Entity	N/A		
Executing Entity Category	N/A		
Minor project objective change	Disposal of approximately 502 tons instead of 850 tons due to the current cost of disposal		Regional strategy document for obsolete pesticide centralization, safeguarding and disposal adopted by regional workshop and approved by steering committee
Safeguards	N/A		
Risk analysis	Due to Covid 19	2020-2022	Steering Committee
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	NO		
Co-financing	NO		
Location of project activity	NO		
Other minor project amendment (define)	NO		

²¹ 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			
States (Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chad, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger and Senegal)	These States will work in the implementation of activities at the national level	Strong participation of the States in the implementation of field activities for all components	Lack of support for post-project activities
Sub-regional institutions (ECOWAS, UEMOA and CILSS)	Are the driving institutions behind the regional harmonization and improvement of pesticide management in the region (West Africa).	The project is implemented in agreement with these sub-regional institutions. Very active participation in the Steering Committees of the project.	These institutions must maintain these activities and scale them up
Research institutions and Academic stakeholders	The project will partner with academic institutions or other international institutions to offer the materials as either new training modules or as an extension of existing modules.	Participation in the implementation of field activities for the component 4 (research on alternatives)	Lack of support for post-project activities
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
The International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA)	is involved in field data collection of pest control practices from the representative network of farmers identified using typology of farming system in each project country.	It is responsible for co-executing component 4	Lack of support for post-project activities (research on alternatives and homologation of bio-pesticides)
Private sector entities			
CropLife International	CLI will be involved in the execution of component 1 as a co-financing partner	CLI has made a financial contribution to the inventories (Senegal) and will contribute to the disposal of 50 tons of obsolete pesticides in Senegal	it would be a good to have the same support for the other countries

Private sector (SOFITEX, SODEFITEX, COTONTCHAD-SN, Compagnie Sucrière du Tchad	They are involved in the sale and distribution of pesticides	They are mainly involved in component 2 for the management of empty containers.	Make contracts for the continuation of the project
<i>Others[1]</i>			
Local communities and farmers communities, women associations	As are obvious beneficiaries of the implementation of this project.	Strong participation of these groups of field activities for all components. The project works with producers' associations and producers' organizations (cotton and market gardeners)	Lack of support for post- project activities

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

10. Gender Mainstreaming

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

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.	Yes	A complete gender analysis was conducted in 2018. The Steering committee adopted the principle of including specific measures in components 2 and 4. This progress has been noted by the MTR.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?	Yes	All reports of the different meetings and trainings take into account the data on gender. The project staff has experience in gender issues and has attended several gender trainings. The project's technical team is composed of 2 men and 3 women
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	Yes	The project encompasses the gender dimension by considering vulnerable groups, and devise appropriate risk mitigation measures when assessing risk and exposure under the current condition of use for these groups. Women and children that work in the farms will benefit from reduced exposure to pesticides through adoption of improved pest management practices and general improvements in pesticide management via increased awareness about the risk of pesticides
b) improving women's participation and decision making	Yes	The Integrated Pest management component includes Farmers Field Schools. FFS is a participatory, gender sensitive approach. In particular, the focus of the training will be on family welfare, exposure of women and children to pesticide hazard, sensitization on aspects of food safety. FFS will also include improvement of agriculture practices that are directly performed by women
c) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women	YES	FFS will also include improvement of agriculture practices that are directly performed by women
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?	YES	All reports of the different meetings and trainings consider the data on gender

2023 Project Implementation Report

Staff with gender expertise	Yes	The project staff has experience in gender issues and has attended several gender trainings
Any other good practices on gender	Yes	Training of women's groups for the transformation of Empty Pesticide containers into paving blocks in Senegal

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.	<p>Knowledge management strategy is included in the document of communication strategy. Relevant good practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Preventive alternative solutions and curative alternative solutions can be found in technical manual and the newsletter (Pests/Pesticide Flash n°7) - Studies on Environmental Assessment (EA) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and rapid environmental Assessment - Triple rinsing, puncturing the containers - Transformation of Empty Pesticide containers into paving blocks
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	<p>Yes. All Newsletters and document Published and shared this year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Several documents on Environmental Assessment (EA) and Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for each country and rapid Environmental Assessment (RAE) for Senegal and Mauritania - 10 newsletters edited and distributed to raise the visibility of the project (more than 850 subscribers) - Production of two video films on the results and achievements of the project. (These films were broadcast on several television channels in Africa, Europe and Canada) - One publication on the Global FFS Platform: "Use of alternatives to synthetic chemical pesticides through Farmer Field Schools in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal" - It has to be noted that the MTR underlined the importance of training activities and the regional nature of the project. It mentioned the following: <i>"Some of the agents who benefited from the project's training were interviewed by the evaluation team and confirmed the importance and usefulness of the knowledge acquired. They also expressed satisfaction with the quality of the training provided.</i> The evaluation team also cross-checked that the knowledge of the participants had improved considerably compared to the baseline. In addition, the regional nature of the project promotes exchanges and learning between the project countries
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Implementation of Farmers' Field School program in Burkina Faso, Senegal and Mali</i> - <i>The IPPM/FFS approach has been implemented by the project. This participatory producer training program is</i>

<p>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.</p>	<p><i>based on the "Integrated Production and crop Pest Management" (IPPM) approach. The curricula have been updated in order to take into account the current needs of producers stemming from the constraints related on the one hand to the effects and impacts of climate change and on the other hand to the exacerbation of the abusive use of chemical pesticides in the cotton area on vegetable crops. This approach developed by the project is an alternative to conventional pesticides used in production systems in the cotton area, reduce the risks related to pesticides and improve the living conditions of producers. It also enables to promote peasant expertise by providing producers with technical decision-making tools for intensified and controlled quality production through expertise exchange. Farmers have declared that they are now abandoning the use of chemical pesticides (MTR).</i></p>
<p>Please provide links to related website, social media account</p>	<p>Subregional Office for West Africa Web site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - https://www.fao.org/africa/news/detail-news/en/c/1470816/ - https://www.fao.org/africa/news/detail-news/en/c/1471568/ - https://www.fao.org/africa/news/detail-news/en/c/1473811/ - https://www.fao.org/africa/news/detail-news/en/c/1472970/ - https://www.fao.org/africa/news/detail-news/en/c/1538650/ <p>Creation of tools for information sharing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specific email address to share information: ppmswapesticides@gmail.com - Mailing list for project implementers at regional and national levels (more than 20 recipients): experts-ppmswa@googlegroups.com - Mailing list for partners (all stakeholders in West Africa and Sahel) with 889 recipients: partners-ppmswa@googlegroups.com
<p>Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.</p>	<p>Publications</p> <p>Newsletters: 8 issues of a Newsletter named “Pesticides Flash” presenting the key achievements per country (Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Chad, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger and Senegal): Access to All Newsletters Published and shared</p> <p>Videos: 2 videos of 13 mn each produced by the TV5 Team and broadcasted widely in 59 countries: Video 1 on the project objective and perspectives: Video in French, English and Portuguese</p>

	Video 2 on project key achievements per component: Video in French, English and Portuguese
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's Name and contact details	Dr Drissi Mehdi Communications Expert Email: Mehdi.Drissi@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.

If applicable, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities.

Do indigenous peoples and or local communities have an active participation in the project activities? If yes, briefly describe how.

- Local communities are involved in the following three areas of the project:
- Outcome 1: Awareness raising on highly hazardous pesticides and pesticide-contaminated sites.
- Outcome 2: Empty-pesticide container management micro-pilots – awareness raising and training.
- Outcome 4: Farmer field schools on alternatives to highly hazardous pesticides.

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing ²³	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Others	CILSS	In kind and cash	9,191,730	2,500,000	380,000	7,450,000
Others	ECOWAS	Cash	5,458,965	271,940	100,000	9,191,730
Others	UEMOA	Cash	5,246,960	280,824	280,824	5,458,965
National Governments	National Governments	In kind	900,000	5,000,000	2,000,000	7,000,000
NGO	CropLife International	Cash	4,430,000	915,000	210,000	4,430,000
NGO	PIP-COLEACP		910,345	-	-	0
Others	IITA	In kind	120,000	300,000		300,000
UN	FAO	In kind	4,508,300	8,000,000		8,500,000
		TOTAL	30,766,300	17,267,764	2,970,824	42,330,695

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

Significant contribution by States in terms of personnel and material resources, in particular warehouses for the storage and surveying of obsolete pesticides
 Very low contribution from regional institutions due to internal financial problems and no budget planning

²²Sources of Co-financing may include: GEF Agency, Donor Agency, Recipient Country Government, Private Sector, Civil Society Organization, Beneficiaries, Other.

²³Grant, Loan, Equity Investment, Guarantee, In-Kind, Public Investment, Other (please refer to the *Guidelines on co-financing* for definitions)

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_FI_GN_01_Cofinancing_Guidelines_2018.pdf

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 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 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:	
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

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.