



## FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

**2019 – Revised Template**

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



### 1. Basic Project Data

#### General Information

<b>Region:</b>	Africa
<b>Country (ies):</b>	Burkina Faso, Chad, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Mauritania, Niger and Senegal
<b>Project Title:</b>	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)
<b>FAO Project Symbol:</b>	GCP/INT/147/GFF
<b>GEF ID:</b>	4740
<b>GEF Focal Area(s):</b>	Chemicals and Waste
<b>Project Executing Partners:</b>	CILSS Executive Secretariat and its technical and administrative branches, ECOWAS, UEMOA and Ministries of Agriculture
<b>Project Duration:</b>	Four years

#### Milestone Dates:

<b>GEF CEO Endorsement Date:</b>	22 December 2014
<b>Project Implementation Start Date/EOD:</b>	1 April 2015
<b>Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	30 March 2019
<b>Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) <sup>2</sup></b>	30 June 2020
<b>Actual Implementation End Date<sup>3</sup>:</b>	

#### Funding

<b>GEF Grant Amount (USD):</b>	7,450,000 USD
<b>Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc<sup>4</sup>:</b>	30,766,300 USD

<sup>1</sup> as per FPMIS

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

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

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

<b>Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):</b>	2,901,654 USD
<b>Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019<sup>5</sup></b>	506,000 USD

### Review and Evaluation

<b>Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:</b>	8 December 2018
<b>Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):</b>	
<b>Mid-term review/evaluation actual:</b>	24 Jun – 14 July 2019
<b>Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	No.
<b>Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).</b>	Yes.
<b>Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:</b>	
<b>Tracking tools/ Core indicators required<sup>6</sup></b>	Yes.

### Ratings

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

### Status

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

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

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

## Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	Antoine Namwinyoh SOME	Antoine.Some@fao.org
<b>Lead Technical Officer</b>	Elisabetta Tagliati	Elisabetta.Tagliati@fao.org
<b>Budget Holder</b>	Gouantoueu Robert Guei	Gouantoueu.Guei@fao.org
<b>TCI-GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division</b>	Kuena Morebotsane, CBC	Kuena.Morebotsane@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
<b>Objective(s): To reduce risk to public health and the environment from POPs and hazardous pesticide waste and contaminated materials</b>						
<b>Outcome 1: Identified risks from existing obsolete stocks eliminated and risk from heavily pesticide-contaminated sites reduced</b>	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	89 staff from 8 countries trained in obsolete pesticide planning and inventory methods.  15 participants from 8 countries and 17 participants from 6 ECOWAS countries trained as trainers on planning and inventory techniques for obsolete pesticides.  14 participants trained on the use of the Pesticides Stocks Management System software.	<b>MS</b>

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

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

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					<p>Nearly 1000 Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) delivered to 9 states by FAO for national inventory teams.</p> <p>More than 1,500 tonnes of obsolete pesticide stocks and associated wastes (quantities, nature and storage conditions) inventoried in Burkina Faso, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Chad.</p> <p>60 tonnes of obsolete pesticide stocks and related wastes evaluated in Cape Verde, The Gambia and Guinea Bissau.</p> <p>Control of sheets, Entering of data Inventory report for the 8 countries completed in October 2018. Data analysis and</p>	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
					verification has been delayed and it is currently ongoing.	
	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	Terms of reference was drafted and International Consultant hired to develop and implement the remediation strategies	<b>MU</b>
<b>Outcome 2: Risks to the environment and human health from empty pesticide containers used in cotton production reduced</b>	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 Mali. None in the other countries		Existing pilot programme in Mali scaled up  Pilot programmes in Burkina Faso, Chad and Senegal operational and a regional container management strategy designed	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.  An expansion scheme for empty pesticide packaging in Mali validated and adopted.	<b>S</b>

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) <sup>7</sup>	Baseline level	Mid-term target <sup>8</sup>	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating <sup>9</sup>
	b) 90% of empty containers triple rinsed in cotton production areas covered by the container management programmes in Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali, and Senegal	<p>Approximately 3,565,000 empty containers generated in the cotton production areas of Burkina Faso, Chad, Mali and Senegal</p> <p>About 100,745 empty containers are collected annually and of which 77,000 are secured and 25, 000 are triple rinsed in Mali.</p>		Pilot programmes in Burkina Faso, Chad and Senegal operational and a regional container management strategy designed.	<p>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)</p> <p>Country thematic group on the management of empty pesticide packaging set up for each country (Burkina Faso, Sénégal and Tchad).</p> <p>National workshops for the assessment of the needs to implement pilot scheme organized.</p>	S
	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 not collected in the cotton production areas		Pilot programmes in Burkina Faso, Chad and Senegal operational and a regional container management strategy designed	N/A for the reporting period	

<p><b>Outcome 3: Regulatory framework and institutional capacity for sound management of pesticides throughout their lifecycle strengthened</b></p>	<p>a) Revised registration system adopted by CILSS, ECOWAS and UEMOA and the countries.</p> <p>Regional regulation and revised national legislations enabling the regional harmonized system enacted or undergoing enactment by the end of the project</p>	<p>A draft CILSS-ECOWAS-UEMOA harmonized instrument for registration and management of pesticides in Western Africa was developed in 2012.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Harmonized registration system submitted for adoption by the three regional bodies, CILSS, ECOWAS and UEMOA and by CILSS countries</p>	<p>Harmonized regional regulation undergoing adoption by regional bodies and countries</p> <p>Revised draft legislations completed and undergoing adoption process in each country</p>	<p>Study of strengths and weaknesses of the ECOWAS regulation C / Reg.3 / 05/2008 and proposal for implementing texts completed and presented to the SC in December 2018</p> <p>Adoption of a COAHP funding mechanism based on a review of the tariffs of CSP acts (file evaluation fees, administrative costs) (inter-institutional meeting, CILSS, WAEMU, February 2018, Niamey)</p> <p>Adoption of a roadmap and working tools to operationalize the COAHP (State Meeting, May 2018, Bamako).</p>	<p><b>MS</b></p>
	<p>b) National Pesticide Management Committees (NPMC) operational with work plan and approved budget.</p> <p>National systems for inspection and</p>	<p>NPMCs were created in all project countries (except Guinea Bissau) in 2002.</p> <p>NPMC Mali is the only operational</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</p>	<p>Capacity building of CNGPs in Burkina Faso, Niger, Gambia, Senegal and Chad on the regulatory framework and regional guidelines for pesticide management and</p>	<p>S</p>

	quality control of pesticides in all nine project countries.	No proper functioning inspection and quality control systems in the countries.		countries Registration of bio-pesticides underway	<p>CNGPs implementation in the Sahel and West Africa.</p> <p>Establishment of the NPMOs of Benin and Côte d'Ivoire with the financial support of WAEMU (co-financing)</p> <p>Implementation of CNGPs in Cape Verde and Guinea with INSAH's own funding</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

<p><b>Outcome 4: IPM alternatives to conventional pesticides successfully promoted in the region and the quantity of highly hazardous pesticides reduced in cotton production areas in three project countries</b></p>	<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 conducted.</p> <p>Registration of bio-pesticides underway</p> <p>Typology studies completed and representative farmer networks established.</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> <p>41 identified alternatives to be tested in in Station (farm field) and CEP (Farmer Field Schools) in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal</p>	<p><b>MS</b></p>
	<p>Changes in use patterns of highly hazardous pesticides and IPM alternatives: % reduction in annual quantity of Highly Hazardous Pesticides used and % increase in use of IPM alternatives</p>	<p>Baseline to be established in year 1.</p> <p>Baseline Knowledge Attitudes and Practices (KAP) survey to be completed in year 1</p>	<p>Endorsed regional strategy for the promotion of alternatives. Farmer Field Schools sessions on identified IPM alternatives in cotton-systems (includes vegetables and</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</p>	<p><b>MS</b></p>

	Behavioural change at farmer level		cereals) in Senegal, Mali and Burkina Faso underway.		FFS, crops: pepper an eggplant; 173 farmers trained including 92% of women) Mali and Burkina Faso  Studies of values chain of promised alternatives in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal available	
<b>Outcome 5:</b>	Quality and timely project reports	Project Results Matrix with outcome and output indicators and targets.		Height six-monthly progress reports. Four Annual project implementation review reports	Eight six-monthly progress reports (PPR). Three Annual project implementation review report (PIR)	<b>S</b>
	Midterm and final evaluation reports			Two evaluations conducted.	Mid-term evaluation on going (24 Jun to 14 July in the field)	<b>S</b>
	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	Development of a communication plan, a communication strategy, a website, a newsletter and a synopsis for the production of a documentary film about the project Newsletter N ° 1 (Pesticides Echos) available Creation and maintenance of the web page  Development of	<b>S</b>

					communication tools (Prospectus, Kakemono, flap folders) to ensure the visibility of the Project	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

---

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p><b>Outcome 1:</b>  <b>a) Approximately 850 tonnes of POPs and other obsolete pesticides disposed of by the end of the project</b></p>	<p>As the PSMS became unavailable, the project team designed Excel sheets similar to those of the PSMS to perform the data entry and the various calculations.</p> <p>The Team will work closely with the an international consultant to re-plan the following activities: data analysis and presentation to relevant officials in countries</p>	<p>Consultant/CTA/LTO/BH</p>	<p>Activities are underway</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1:</b>  <b>b) 8 highly contaminated sites remediated and risks reduced by at least 50% (decline in contaminants in soil)</b></p>	<p>The Team will work closely with the international consultant to re-plan the following activities: development and implementation the remediation strategies</p>	<p>Consultant/CTA/ LTO/BH</p>	<p>Activities are underway</p>
<p><b>Outcome 3: Regulatory framework and institutional capacity for sound management of pesticides throughout their lifecycle strengthened</b></p>	<p>INSAH failed to meet almost all due deadlines for the expected outputs. All deliverables were received after the end of the LOA (May 2018), making difficult for the CTA and the team to assess their quality and effectively leveraging the role of the national focal points. The preparation and signature of the second LoA has also suffered INSAH’s unresponsiveness and it is still not signed. This has entailed a delay of one year among the two LOAs.</p> <p>The Team will work closely to monitor the implementation of the second LOA. There will also be a need to reduce the scope of the component, after the results of the mid-term evaluation are made available</p>	<p>CTA/LTO/BH</p>	<p>immediately</p>

## 2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs <sup>11</sup>	Expected completion date <sup>12</sup>	Achievements at each PIR <sup>13</sup>					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance <sup>14</sup> or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 <sup>st</sup> PIR	2 <sup>nd</sup> PIR	3 <sup>rd</sup> PIR	4 <sup>th</sup> PIR	5 <sup>th</sup> PIR		
Output 1.1. Inventory of obsolete pesticides and associated wastes Updated/ validated in 8 all countries	Q4 Y3	Regional and national training on the pesticides inventory completed	Inventories completed in 5 countries  Evaluation of stock of obsolete pesticides are made in 3 countries	Control of sheets, Entering and calculation of data			90%	As the PSMS was failing, the project team designed Excel sheets similar to those of PSMS to perform the data entry and various calculations
Output 1.2 Up to 850 metric tons of POPs pesticides safely destroyed in an environmentally sound manner	Q4Y4	Ongoing activity for the preparation of the baseline studies of waste and plans for action for each country	Initial discussion on Environmental Management Plan to be prepared	Terms of reference for the recruitment of international consultant was drafted and an international consultant was hired			10%	With the resignation of PEPPPO from the project, the team recruited an international consultant to implement this output
Output 1.3 Risks from eight highly contaminated sites	Q3Y3	Ongoing activity for the preparation of	No progress	Terms of reference for the recruitment of			10%	With the resignation of PEPPPO from the project, an international consultant was

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

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

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

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

quantified, remediation strategies developed and implemented		the baseline studies of waste and plan for action for each country		international consultant was drafted and an international consultant was hired				hired to implement this output
Output 2.1 Pilot container management scheme in Mali scaled up in Kita and Koutiala cotton production areas	Q4Y3	n/a	Evaluations of the management of the pilot scheme for empty pesticide containers in Mali (Kita and Koutiala) completed	The pilot scheme is positively evaluated and recommended for its expansion to other areas of Mali			50%	With the resignation of PEPPPO from the project this output was stalled.
Output 2.2 Containers management systems piloted in cotton producing areas in three project countries (Burkina Faso, Chad and Senegal)	Q4Y3	n/a	A strategy to extend the pilot scheme to the other 3 countries validated and adopted	The needs for pilot scheme development evaluated by the 3 countries			50%	With the resignation of PEPPPO from the project an international consultant was hired to implement this output in the 3 countries
Output 2.3 A regional strategy for the management of empty pesticides containers developed	Q2Y4	n/a	Needs assessment for the implementation of empty packaging management pilot plans in the other 3 countries (Burkina Faso, Chad and Senegal) underway (Jun	An expansion scheme for empty pesticide management including the life cycle of pesticides is validated and adopted for the region			50%	Ditto

			2018)					
Output .3.1 A regional regulation for common pesticide registration system for participating CILSS member states drafted and submitted for endorsement by regional and national authorities	Q2Y3	Draft of the Evaluation of the ECOWAS regulation C/Reg.3/05/2008 under review	Strengths and weaknesses of the ECOWAS regulation  Proposal of implementing texts made	Terms of reference for the recruitment of consultants for the implementing texts were drafted			60%	The implementing texts will be completed during the second LoA
Output .3.2 The common registration system operational	Q4Y4	n/a	Establishment of COAHP	Adoption of COAHP funding  Adoption of roadmap and working tools			75%	To be completed during the second LoA
Output .3.3 Action plans to monitor pesticide life-cycle stages developed and implemented by NPMCs and systems for inspection piloted	Q4Y3	n/a	Support the implementation of CNGPs in accordance with CILSS guidelines	Capacity building of CNGPs of 5 countries  Establishment of CNGPs of 2 countries Implementation of CNGP of 2 countries			75%	Establishment and implementation of CGPS will be completed during the second LoA
Output 3.4 Regional analytical services and quality control of pesticides strengthened to serve nine	Q3Y3	n/a	n/a	Terms of reference for the recruitment of consultants for this evaluation were drafted			10%	This evaluation will be done during the second LoA

participating countries								
Output 4.1.A regional action plan for the promotion of IPM developed.	Q1Y4	Establishment of priority zones and producers  Characterization of farm structure in cotton-growing areas in 3 countries  Establishment of a representative network for farmers in 3 countries	List of alternatives available	Studies of values chains of promised alternatives			30%	The draft of this plan will be available during this LoA
Output 4.2 List of proven IPM alternatives established	Q1Y2		Identification of IPM in 3 countries	List of IPM established			100%	
Output 4.3 Selected promising IPM alternatives scaled up in Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal	Q1Y3	n/a	List of alternatives available	Identification and by countries the crops on which alternative will promoted  Implementation of FFS in 3 countries Studies of value chains			75%	LOA2 with IITA

Output 4.4 Communication strategy for the communication of risk and promotion of IPM alternatives developed and implemented in all 9 countries	Q4Y3	n/a	the Project developed: A communication plan - An information and communication strategy for the project - A draft of Newsletter - A website	Writing a N° 1 of the Newsletter  Creation and maintenance of the web page  Development of communication tools			50%	It was recommended by the steering committee to rely on private sector to guarantee the sustainability of the Newsletter
Output 5.1 Project monitoring system providing six-monthly reports on progress in achieving project outputs and outcomes six-monthly reports on progress in achieving project outputs and outcomes	Q4Y4	Two PPR and one PIR submitted	Four PPR and Two PIR submitted	Eight PPR and Three PIR submitted			100%	
Output 5.2: Midterm and final evaluation reports Midterm and final evaluation reports	Q4Y4	N/A	N/A	The Midterm evaluation is underway (24 Jun -14 july)			40%	
Output 5.3:Project “best-practices” and “lessons-learned” disseminated via publications, project website and others	Q4Y4	n/a	the Project approved: Acommunication plan - An information and communication strategy for the project - A draft of Newsletter - A website	Writing a N° 1 of the Newsletter  Creation and maintenance of web page			50%	

## 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:

Main significant results:

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

- 89 staff from different project countries trained in obsolete pesticide planning and inventory methods.
- 15 participants from 8 Project / CILSS countries (Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Chad) and seventeen (17) participants from 6 ECOWAS countries funded by Green Cross (Guinea, Liberia, Central African Republic, São Tomé and Príncipe, Sierra Leone, Togo) were trained as trainers on planning and inventory techniques for obsolete pesticides (January 30, to February 03, 2017 in Bamako).
- More than 1,500 tonnes of obsolete pesticide stocks and associated wastes (quantities, nature and storage conditions) have been inventoried in Burkina Faso, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Chad.
- 60 tonnes of obsolete pesticide stocks and related wastes were evaluated in Cape Verde, The Gambia and Guinea Bissau
- 14 participants, including two (2) per country, (Cape Verde, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Chad); four (4) from Burkina Faso and two (2) GreenCross experts were trained on the use of the Pesticides Stocks Management System software (19-14 February 2018, Burkina Faso).

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

- The pilot scheme for the management of empty pesticide packaging in Mali is positively evaluated (successful) and validated and recommended for its expansion to other areas of Mali.
- An expansion scheme for empty pesticide packaging including the life cycle of pesticides and the introduction of an eco-tax on primary packaging placed on the market (polluter pays principle) is validated and adopted (regional workshop, June 2018, Bamako)
- A strategy to extend the pilot scheme in the other three countries (Burkina Faso, Senegal and Chad) which includes a system of disposal at the regional level is validated and adopted (Bamako regional workshop of June 2018)

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

- Strengths and weaknesses of the ECOWAS regulation C / Reg.3 / 05/2008 and proposal of implementing texts made through a legal study.
- Adoption of a COAHP funding mechanism based on an assumption based essentially on a review of the tariffs of CSP acts (file evaluation fees, administrative costs) (inter-institutional meeting, CILSS, WAEMU, February 2018, Niamey)

- Adoption of a roadmap and working tools to operationalize the COAHP (State Meeting, May 2018, Bamako).Capacity building of CNGPs in Burkina Faso (workshop held on February 22 and 23, 2018) Niger(workshop held on March, 06 an 07 2018), Gambia (workshop was held on 13 and 14 February 2018 in Banjul) , Senegal, (workshop held on April 26-27, 2018) and Chad (workshop on March 21 and 22, 2018) through sensitization and training on the regulatory framework and regional guidelines for pesticide management in the Sahel and West Africa, the process implementation of CNGPs in accordance with CILSS guidelines.
- Establishment of the NPMOs of Benin and Côte d'Ivoire with the financial support of WAEMU (co-financing).
- Implementation of CNGPs in Cape Verde and Guinea with INSAH's own funding

Outcome 4 - IPM alternatives to conventional pesticides successfully promoted in the region and the quantity of highly hazardous pesticides reduced in cotton production areas in three project countries

- Establishment of priority zones and producers - cotton-growing areas - connection with the GIPD project in the 3 countries (Burkina-Faso, Mali, Senegal).
- Characterization of farm structure in cotton-growing areas of Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal).
- Identification and by country of the crops on which alternatives will be promoted.
- The identification of the alternatives to be tested in Station (farm field) and CEP (Farmer Field Schools) recommended by participants in national workshops.
- The establishment of a representative network for farmers (Burkina, Senegal and Mali).
- 41 identified alternatives (Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal) of which 29% (biological control by aqueous extracts); endogenous knowledge (22%) and classical biological control by parasitoids.

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

Max 200 words:

- The non-functionality of PSMS: the project team had to design excel sheets similar to those of PSMS, with delays due to the need of retrieving formula and replicate the system manually.
- The resignation of PEPPPO from the project: PEPPPO was responsible of component 1 and 2. After the end of first LOA, negotiations started for the preparation of the second LOA. After several exchanges with PEPPPO, the provider decided to withdraw from the programme. With the resignation of PEPPPO, the team had to hire 4 consultants to carry out: data analysis, management of empty containers schemes, remediation of highly contaminated sites and the preparation of the environmental management plan. With the resignation of PEPPPO from the project this output 2.1 (Pilot container management scheme in Mali scaled up in Kita and Koutiala

cotton production areas) was stopped. It is impossible to implement these activities, as PEPP0 is responsible for these areas

- Organization and holding of the steering committee (8 December 18, in Gambia): this meeting was postponed several times. This delay created some drawbacks, in particular for the needed extension. A revision of the composition of the Steering Committee, to facilitate the regular holding of the sessions and to balance the representation of the institutions has been proposed.
- Limited time availability at certain times of the Service Providers experts due to conflicting deadlines of their own institutions (CILSS, PEPP0). The SPs provide good expertise and knowledge but it is often embodied in one/two persons. The Team has worked closely with the SPs to re-plan the workplan and help them to implement their activities
- The implementation of the LOA by INSAH has been quite problematic, with 4 main issues:
  - Delay in the implementation: there are only 2 INSAH staff dedicated to this LOA. The initial planning has been disrupted by the involvement of these persons in various activities outside the scope of the LOA. This has caused an overall substantial delay, which is now made even worse by their unresponsiveness with the preparation of the second LOA.
  - Involvement of FAO: despite several requests, INSAH has failed in including FAO in the country activities. This is a pity as the project disposes of 8 national experts to ensure the link between the project's activities and national authorities. If implicated, they could be crucial in following up at the national level and ensure durability of actions beyond the project's lifespan
  - Low financial delivery: this has been about 60% of the budget
  - Outputs delivery: INSAH failed to respect almost all deadlines for the expected outputs
- Overspending of C1 due to more capacity building than planned and major implication of national counterparts. Also, each component has almost exhausted CTA resources allocated by the initial budget, due to the longer period of implementation

## Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Objective rating <sup>15</sup>	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating <sup>16</sup>	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
<b>Project Manager / Coordinator</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	The various delay in the initial phases has slowed the deliveries during the previous periods. The planned activities in the first LoA were reached satisfactorily. Most of activities planned in the ProDoc will closed in the forthcoming year. The project needs to be extended to Jun 2021 as requested by the steering committee
<b>Budget Holder</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	The LTO acknowledges the efforts of the team to catch up initial delays. This delay during the current period is due to the limited time availability of the Service Providers experts to implement the activities. In the upcoming period and following results 'of the mid-term evaluation, some activities will have to be reduced, cancelled or reviewed to be aligned with the remaining implementation period and budget
<b>Lead Technical Officer<sup>17</sup></b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	Despite close follow up by the team and several discussions, two out of three service providers continue to have a slow responsiveness to the project's implementation needs. This will have to be taken into account when evaluating what will be achievable in the remaining lifespan of the project. The final inventoried quantities of pesticides to be eliminated are much higher than expected. This will probably entail longer negotiations with the countries for deciding the quantities to be eliminated per country.

<sup>15</sup> **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

<sup>17</sup> The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

<b>GEF Funding Liaison Officer</b>	<b>MU</b>	<b>MU</b>	The project was extended by more than 12 months, still implementation has not improved. A mid-term review has just been completed and the project team, partners and FAO have to consider carefully findings and recommendations of the MTR and come up with a clear plan how to bring the project back on track.
------------------------------------	-----------	-----------	---

### 3. Risks

**Environmental and Social Safeguards** (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

<b>Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)</b>	<b>Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid<sup>18</sup>. If not, what is the new classification and explain.</b>
Risk Classification B	<p>Yes.</p> <p>As planned, to mitigate these risks the project will follow FAO’s Environmental Management Tool Kits (EMTK) for the assessment, safeguarding, transportation and disposal of obsolete pesticides. Environmental Management Plans (EMP) will be developed for the safeguarding activities</p>

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

**Risk ratings**

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

---

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

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
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	The steering committee recommended seeking additional funds from donors Negotiating of additional funds with GEF. Finding new partners for funding		Priorization will be needed once final figures are available. The risk is not only linked to the achievement of the objectives, but also political
2	Institutional arrangements pose challenges to project execution	L	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	Discussions are underway	
3	Extreme weather conditions such as torrential rain and floods.	L-M			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

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

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

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	Environmental contamination from leakage of POPs and other obsolete pesticides due to poor conditions of containers	M			Management measures to be included in the EMP include field procedures to ensure no further leakage occurs during the project activities. 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	Training was executed		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
6	Insufficient ownership of the drafted uniform regional regulation	L	Inception workshop was held Two steering committee meeting were held		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.

	Risk	Risk rating <sup>19</sup>	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions <sup>20</sup>	Notes from the Project Task Force
7	Low uptake of alternative technologies by producers	L	FFS was implemented		A large-scale information and awareness-raising campaign about the modes of application and effectiveness of the proposed alternatives will be undertaken to help promote uptake of alternatives. Another strategy is to employ existing farmer field schools networks. The promotion of IPM through FFS has been quite successful in previous related initiatives

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium	Medium	The end of the first batch of LoA and the delay in drafting the next one slowed the continuation of activities for C1, C2 and C3. Positive results achieved under C4. In the upcoming period and following results 'of the mid-term evaluation, some activities will have to be reduced, cancelled or reviewed to be aligned with the remaining implementation period and budget

## 4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

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

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project Outcomes</b>		
<b>Project Outputs</b>	Yes	<p>With the resignation of PEPPPO from the project this output 2.1 (Pilot container management scheme in Mali scaled up in Kita and Koutiala cotton production areas) was stopped It is impossible to implement these activities, as PEPPPO is responsible for these areas</p> <p>Website updating: The project team seeks to insert this web page at the level of the web page of FAORAF or one of our partner institutions (CILSS, ECOWAS, WAEMU)</p> <p>Writing and publishing the newsletter is suspended: It was recommended by the SC to rely (this activity) on private actors to guarantee the sustainability of the Newsletter</p>

### 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.

---

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
<b>Project extension</b>	<p>Original NTE: 31 March 2019 Current NTE 30 Jun 2020</p> <p>Justification: the late start of project activities and the delays in the implementation caused by the unavailability of PSMS and delays incurred by two service providers. The new NTE has been pre-approved by the SC pending an appraisal of the mid-term evaluation results</p>

## 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)?**

A complete gender analysis was conducted in 2018. The Steering committee adopted the principle of including specific measures in components 2 and 4.

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.

In addition, 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.

## 6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

Outcome 1: awareness in the dangerous pesticides and heavily pesticide-contaminated sites.

Outcome 2: The pilot scheme was implemented with local communities. The ultimate aim of this outcome is the development of a regional strategy for pesticide container management across all project countries. The risks will be reduced firstly, by changing behaviours of male and female farmers through the promotion of “triple rinsing” and puncturing of containers once the contents have been used. Local communities involve in collection of empty pesticide containers used, awareness, and training

Outcome 4: local communities involve in: Establishment of a representative farmer network of male and female farmers based on the structure and functioning of farms in each agro ecological zone through participation in surveys; Collection field data on pest control practices; Field demonstrations on potential alternatives; Farmers Field School training; Implementation of Farmer Field School.

## 7. Stakeholders Engagement

List of stakeholders	Category	Engagement mechanism
<b>CILSS</b> (Comité permanent inter-États de lutte contre la sécheresse dans le Sahel)	Regional Institution	Formal Agreement - CILSS Will host the coordination Unit
<b>ECOWAS</b> (Economic Community of West African States)	Regional Institution	Formal Agreement - Chair of the Steering Committee
<b>UEMOA</b> (West African Economic and Monetary Union)	Regional Institution	Formal Agreement - Co-Chair of the steering Committee and co-financing of INSAH activities
<b>CLI</b> (CropLife International)	NGO	Joint implementation of activities in Senegal (Output 1.2)
<b>ILO</b> (International Labour Organization)	UN Agency	Joint implementation of activities in Benin (Output 4.2)
<b>CORAF</b> (Conseil Ouest Africain pour la Recherche)	Regional Research institution	Informal - Participation to the Steering Committee
<b>Green Cross Switzerland</b>	NGOs	Joint implementation of activities (Output 1.1)
<b>INSAH/CILSS</b> (Institut du Sahel)	Specialized Institution of CILSS	Formal Agreement (LoA) - implementation of activities for Outcome 3
<b>IIAT</b> (Institut International d'Agriculture Tropical)	International Research institution	Formal Agreement (LoA) - implementation of activities for Outcome 4
<b>Ministry of Agriculture</b> in each country	Government	Participation in training and pesticide inventories
<b>Ministry of Environment</b> in each country	Government	Participation in training and pesticide inventories
<b>PEPPO</b> (Programme d'élimination des Pesticide Obsolètes Mali)	NGO	Formal Agreement (LoA) - implementation of activities for Outcome 1 and 2

**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))**

The Steering Committee of Dec 2018 has been a major stakeholder consultation event. The meeting recommended:

- to engage / involve regional OIGs (ECOWAS, CILSS and WAEMU) in the project: i) to support the implementation of certain activities and support the political aspects; ii) to capitalize the results and disseminate the achievements, through the IGOs networks; iii) for involvement in transfer of results;
- to propose to the GEF an extension of at least two years of the project until March 2021;
- to engage in negotiations with GEF or other partners to finance the disposal of inventoried pesticides;
- to engage in negotiations to extend the project to six other Sahel and West African countries: Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and Togo.
- to involve the private sector (importers/distributors), the big cotton companies and engage them. Extend the current cooperation experience with CLI in Senegal, to other countries
- Set up solutions to prevent the unavailability of the FAO PSMS system (Alternate plan and risk calculation sheet) so as not to delay the continuation of activities
- Integrate the gender and children aspect and the participation of women in activities, without having a significant impact on the project's already limited budget.

## 8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits

The pilot scheme for the management of empty pesticide packaging in Mali was positively evaluated and recommended for its expansion to other areas of Mali. 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). Country thematic group on the management of empty pesticide packaging set up for each country (Burkina Faso, Senegal and Tchad). National workshops for the assessment of the needs to implement pilot scheme organized. This system reduce the pollution of environment

The implementation of Famers Fields School in 3 countries (Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal) involved more than 650 farmers the first year. These farmers were made aware of the use of alternative and have adopted these alternatives. These promising alternatives reduce pollution of crop, and environment.

## 9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing <sup>22</sup>	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
Others	CILSS	In kind and cash	9,191,730	280,000	280,000	671,810
Others	ECOWAS	Cash	5,458,965	-	-	-
Others	UEMOA	Cash	5,246,960	253,000	253,000	367,000
National Governments	National Governments	In kind	900,000	600,000	450,000	900,000
NGO	CropLife International	Cash	4,430,000	210,000	210,000	417,000
NGO	PIP-COLEACP		910,345	-	-	-
Others	IITA	In kind	120,000	70,000		120,000
UN	FAO	In kind	4,508,300	3,000,000		
		<b>TOTAL</b>	30,766,300	4,313,000		

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

We did not receive the co-financing from Ecowas. But the in-kind contribution of national governments (contribution of national experts to project activities, meeting space, travel car....) is much appreciated.

<sup>22</sup> Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

## Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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