



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

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)	5
3. IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS (IP).....	14
4. SUMMARY ON PROGRESS AND RATINGS	20
5. ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS (ESS)	23
6. RISKS	25
7. FOLLOW-UP ON MID-TERM REVIEW OR SUPERVISION MISSION (ONLY FOR PROJECTS THAT HAVE CONDUCTED AN MTR)	28
8. MINOR PROJECT AMENDMENTS	30
9. STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	31
10. GENDER MAINSTREAMING	32
11. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	33
12. INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES INVOLVEMENT	34
13. CO-FINANCING TABLE	35

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Eastern Europe and Central Asia
Country (ies):	Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Türkiye
Project Title:	Lifecycle Management of Pesticides and Disposal of POPs Pesticides in Central Asian countries and Türkiye
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/SEC/011/GFF
GEF ID:	5000
GEF Focal Area(s):	Chemicals (Persistent Organic Pollutants – POPs)
Project Executing Partners:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Azerbaijan: Ministries of Agriculture, Environment and Health, Food Safety Agency (new, not in ProDoc); b) Kazakhstan: Ministries of Agriculture, Environment and Health; c) Kyrgyzstan: Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Natural Resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision (new, not in ProDoc. Changes are due to fundamental government reorganisation in spring 2021); d) Tajikistan: State Committee on Environmental Protection in collaboration with the Ministries of Agriculture and Health; e) Türkiye: Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry.
Initial project duration (years):	4 years
Project coordinates: <i>This section should be completed ONLY by:</i> <i>a) Projects with 1st PIR;</i> <i>b) In case the geographic coverage of project activities has changed since last reporting period.</i>	See separate Annex 2 Excel file with Geolocation information.

Project Dates

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	14 October 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	15 October 2018
Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	14 October 2022
Revised project implementation End date (if approved) ²	31 December 2024

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	USD 8,136,986
Total Co-financing amount (USD)³:	USD 38,300,000

¹ As per FPMIS

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

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

Total GEF grant delivery (as of June 30, 2023 (USD):	USD 3,655,868
Total GEF grant actual expenditures (excluding commitments) as of June 30, 2023 (USD)⁴:	USD 2,874,086
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2023⁵	USD 118,157,518 (for details, see breakdown in Section 13)

M&E Milestones

Date of Last Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting:	3rd Regional Steering Committee Meeting held 13 June 2023 in Antalya, Türkiye
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	14 October 2020
Actual Mid-term review date (if already completed):	17 May 2022
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date⁷:	July 2024
Tracking tools (TT)/Core indicators (CI) updated before MTR or TE stage (provide as Annex)	Done at the MTR stage

Overall ratings

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

ESS risk classification

Current ESS Risk classification:	High (unchanged)
---	------------------

Status

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Coordinator	Stephan Robinson, Senior Technical Advisor, FAO SEC	stephan.robinson@fao.org

⁴ The amount should show the values included in the financial statements generated by IMIS.

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

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

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

(PC)		
Budget Holder (BH)	Viorel Gutu (Operations Specialist supporting the BH: Sebnem Gürbüz)	sebnem.gurbuz@fao.org
GEF Operational Focal Points (GEF OFP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AZE: Emin Garabaghli, Head, International Cooperation Division, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources - KAZ: Zulfiya Suleimenova, Minister, Ministry of Environment - KGZ: Chyngyz Kochorov, Head, Secretariat of the Global Program for the Conservation of the Snow Leopard and Its Ecosystem, Ministry of Natural Resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision - TJK: Bahodur Ahmadjon Sheralizoda, Chairman, Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan - TUR: Ebubekir Gizligider, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry 	
Lead Technical Officer (LTO)	Tania Santivanez, Regional Agricultural Officer, FAO REU	tania.santivanez@fao.org
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	Kaan Evren Basaran, Funding Liaison Officer	kaan.basaran@fao.org

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 ⁸	Baseline	Mid-term Target ⁹	End-of-project Target	Cumulative progress ¹⁰ since project start level (and %) at 30 June 2023	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective(s): Reduce releases of POPs from obsolete pesticide stock-piles and strengthen capacity for sound pesticide management throughout the life cycle in 4 Central Asian countries and Türkiye	Outcome 1: 900 tonnes of POPs and obsolete pesticides are disposed of in an environmentally sound manner; and risks from obsolete stocks, contaminated sites and empty pesticide containers are further quantified	a) Technical capacity available for environmentally sound disposal options for POPs and other hazardous wastes in the Central Asian region	No environmentally sound disposal option existing due to inability to export wastes because of transit restrictions. Alternatives in the region need to be evaluated: CKT, SCWO, HTI to be built/upgraded	Year 1: Follow up investigation on the feasibility of POPs pesticides disposal in AZE, TJK and TUR completed	Year 3: Test destruction in new regional facility completed	Output 1.1: National inventories - Azerbaijan: Inventory of 19 sites was done in 2019. All sites must be considered contaminated. At seven sites, total of 350 metric tonnes (MT) of OP identified, additional buried amount of 100 MT suspected at one site. In addition, 10'000+ MT of obsolete pesticides (mostly POPs) centralised at Jangi landfill and at least 25'000 MT of contaminated soil needing treatment. Azerbaijan requested in April 2023 an additional inventory in its new areas, however, this would be pending on receiving more information on the locations and prior demining of the sites and access roads; - Kazakhstan: Three out of 17 Oblasts have been inventoried in 2H/2022 (the remaining Oblasts should be inventoried in 2H/2023). Based on initial screening of historical data, 255 sites were visited. Only at 48 sites, OP could still be found, totalling 2.3 MT of solid and liquid pesticides and 98'634 m ³ of piles with mixed pesticides and contaminated soil. - Kyrgyzstan: National inventory of 62 sites in 2021. At 26 sites, approximately 5'000 MT of OP found (90 % buried at three landfills, rest scattered at stores). Many of the former store sites are ownerless, in poor condition, posing a potential hazard to human health and the environment; - Tajikistan: Project inventoried obsolete pesticides in Sukhd Oblast and reconciled data from various prior inventories to generate a first national inventory. Data show that main challenge in Tajikistan is not obsolete pesticides in stores but the large volumes of contaminated soil around the 200 mini-landfills.	S
				Year 2: Disposal strategy		Output 1.2: Disposal strategy	S

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

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

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

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory** (HS), **Satisfactory** (S), **Moderately Satisfactory** (MS), **Moderately Unsatisfactory** (MU), **Unsatisfactory** (U), and **Highly Unsatisfactory** (HU).

	and reduced		ded.	(new technology in the region or export) agreed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional disposal strategy developed 2021, update planned for autumn 2023; - Options for export for disposal were investigated with negative result for all countries. Last turnaround received in 2023 in communication between KGZ and China; - Azerbaijan: The Holcim Garadagh cement kiln was benchmarked in 2021 for its ability to co-process POPs wastes in compliance with relevant Basel Convention Technical Guidelines. Discussion was held with GEF on 10 June 2022 whether and how to move forward with testing and permitting co-processing. GEF directed to explore further the option of co-processing in close collaboration with GEF STAP and with all steps to be documented for GEF. Following a meeting with Holcim Azerbaijan and Geocycle (the alternative fuels arm of Holcim) in Baku in September 2022 to discuss the benchmark results and the further way forward, a scientific-technical assessment of the probability of successful destruction of POPs pesticides in compliance with the Basel Convention Technical Guidelines at the Holcim Garadagh kiln was undertaken in 2H/2022. - Kazakhstan: Benchmarking of one cement kiln (JSC "Jambyl Cement", Vicat company) for its ability to co-process POPs wastes in compliance with the relevant Basel Convention Technical Guidelines was done in December 2022. While based on the initial assessment, the plant is probably technically able to co-process POPs wastes, the country lacks legislation/regulations on high-temperature treatment of wastes. As treatment of hazardous wastes is to happen in a legally regulated space, hence, legislation should be developed as first priority; - Kyrgyzstan: A round-table was held on 20 April 2023 in Bishkek to discuss the development of a national strategy for OP management. The draft strategy should be finalised by end August 2023 and then submitted for stakeholder consultation. - Webinars were held on POPs disposal options (24 June 2020, 21 participants) and empty pesticides container management systems (CMS) (14 October 2020, 170 participants). 	
	b) 900 tonnes of POPs and other obsolete pesticides safeguarded and disposed of	TUR: 1'239 tonnes of waste safeguarded	<p>Year 1: National inventories updated and validated in AZE, KAZ, and TJK</p> <p>Year 2: Risk reduction and disposal strategies for obsolete stocks adopted in AZE, KAZ and TJK and start of implementation</p>	<p>Year 3: Inventoried stocks safeguarded in AZE, KGZ, and TJK (if disposal options in KGZ and TJK available).</p> <p>Start of disposal in AZE (KGZ and TJK)</p> <p>Year 4: Disposal of min. 900 MT completed in AZE (KGZ and TJK)</p>	<p>Output 1.3: Safeguarding and disposal of 900 metric tonnes (MT)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Azerbaijan: 210.342 MT of liquid POPs and other obsolete pesticides were safeguarded at the central Jangi landfill. Materials are now repacked in 11,402 UN-approved drums in a locked store building and awaiting disposal at a national disposal facility (as mentioned above, export for disposal is not possible). MoA also asked for support to improve management of Jangi landfill. A questionnaire was sent to MoA to better assess their needs for improving landfill management and develop a more targeted training in 2H/2023; - Kyrgyzstan: Planning was initiated for the safeguarding of obsolete pesticides wastes at 26 sites. Discussions showed, however, that before safeguarding can start, 1-2 central stores need to be built first and several legal questions resolved on land and waste ownership. - Türkiye: A tender was drafted for the safeguarding and disposal of 10 MT of obsolete 	<p>S</p> <p>S</p>

					<p>pesticides.</p> <p>Output 1.4: Contaminated sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Azerbaijan: Initial site investigations of contaminated sites were undertaken at Ujar and Salyan. A national lab for analysing environmental samples was selected. It was decided to continue with a detailed site investigation and development of a site management plan for the Ujar site; - Kazakhstan: Lab trials for bio- and phytoremediation of POPs and heavy metals contaminated soils has started; - Kyrgyzstan: A field trial of bio-remediation of soil contaminated with 19 different POPs pesticides showed substantial acceleration of decomposition process. Germination tests at the end showed that soil vitality was improved and soil toxicity reduced. In addition, laboratory trials with bacteria immobilising heavy-metals started. A new LoA is under development aiming at closing knowledge gaps and further maturing this cost-effective remediation approach for low-level contaminated soil. - Tajikistan: Vakhsh landfill is upgraded to become a recipient site for excavated obsolete pesticides from mini-landfills being remediated. Topographical map for site management and planning developed. Store annex able to host about 1'000 MT of obsolete pesticides and other materials was built in 1Q/2023 (inaugurated on 8 April 2023). In preparation of remediation of DDT-containing mini-landfill at Village #1, the 2018 detailed site investigation and related remediation plan were reviewed. Currently, tender for construction of soil cells at Vakhsh landfill and for the excavation of Village #1 mini-landfill is under development. <p>Output 1.5: Container management system (CMS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CMS and Agricultural Plastic Waste (APW) baseline assessed in all five project countries; - Various types of working group meetings were held in 2022/2023 to develop further national road maps for CMS. All five countries are developing now plans for pilot projects in 2024. In Tajikistan, emphasis is on developing legislation imposing an obligation to return/collect empty containers. - Türkiye: 50 collection containers for empty pesticide packaging were provided for the Silifke region. The inauguration meeting was held on 2 June 2023, a flyer (1'000 copies) explaining the risks related to improper disposal of empty pesticide packaging and how to use the collection containers was developed and distributed to farmers. - Assessment of CMS legal framework showed that regulation is widely absent in all countries. FAO plans to develop generic CMS regulations which can be used as a model. 	S
	c) % of populations engaging in	Communication strategies in KGZ have identified	Year 1: KAP survey to describe	Year 4: KAP survey indicates	<p>Output 1.6: Risk communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kazakhstan: Process of establishing a national network on pesticide risk communication is ongoing. The network should continue to work on pesticide risk communication beyond 	S

		high risk behaviours that expose them to sources of obsolete pesticides	exposure routes from stockpile sites in communities through children's behaviours and illegal excavation of products. Similar and other exposure routes have not been formally documented or quantified in any country.	behaviours and set baseline % of respondents Year 2-3: Communication activities designed and implemented in 3 countries	declines of 30-50 % in high risk behaviours compared to 1st KAP.	the life-time of this project. - Tajikistan: Four awareness raising seminars on risks by obsolete pesticides were organised 8-11 November 2022. All four seminars together attracted about 140 participants from as various stakeholder groups as central, regional and local administrations and services, farmers, women's organisations, NGOs, Aarhus centre, etc. A leaflet and a poster were specifically developed for the four seminars. The overall number of printed leaflets (A4) and posters (100*70cm) is 1000 Tajik and 100 English copies, each. In addition, 200 A3 size posters (Tajik only) were printed. The materials can be accessed at: https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cc2765en (leaflets), and https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/CC2777EN (posters).	
Outcome 2: Regulatory and institutional framework for pesticide management strengthened in five countries	a) National legislations comply with international standards in AZE, KGZ, and TJK	Legal assessments conducted for AZE, KGZ and TJK have identified specific gaps in the existing laws, and recommend development of secondary legislation	Year 2: Draft revised and harmonized pesticide legislation in AZE, KGZ and TJK	Year 3: Drafts consulted and approved by stakeholders for presentation to government for adoption	Output 2.1: Legal assessments - Assessments of the legal frameworks on pesticide life-cycle management were undertaken in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan. Synthesis report showing regional commonalities and shortcomings was developed; - The Azerbaijan assessment report was updated in spring 2023 to include recent legislative updates; - The Kyrgyz assessment report was presented on 20 April 2023 in a workshop in Bishkek; - The Kazakhstan legal assessment was finished in 2Q/2023; - The assessments showed that CMS legal regulations are widely absent in all countries. FAO plans to develop generic CMS regulations which can be used as a model; - Azerbaijan: National Profile needed for the ratification of the Rotterdam Convention was developed in 2Q/2023; - Tajikistan: Work for developing the National Profile needed for the ratification of the Rotterdam Convention started; - A regional meeting was co-organised with the Rotterdam Secretariat. The meeting which is held 4-6 July 2023 in Baku should accelerate ratification of the Rotterdam Convention by several countries, including Azerbaijan and Tajikistan.	S	

	b) Data requirements for pesticide registration are more comprehensive	Registration of pesticides is possible in all countries without the full data requirements set out in the Code of Conduct and FAO/WHO specifications	Year 1: Training provided and manuals and guidance translated and published	Year 4: Labelling and packaging requirements; operator exposure data; pesticide specification data all required for dossiers	Output 2.2: Registration procedures + Output 2.3: Field data on PPE use and spraying operations - A regional report on the gender, socio-economic and health dimensions of pesticide use and management in Central Asia and Türkiye was developed. The report includes data on current spraying practices in various agricultural sectors and countries and shows that in general women have less access to information on safe spraying practices and on PPE selection and use. An additional report covering Kazakhstan is under development; - Kyrgyzstan: The country plans to develop an electronic registration and sellers licensing system. Three systems were evaluated for their (partial) suitability: System used by the Eurasian Economic Union, Turkish registration system, and FAO locust system. KGZ MoA decided in June 2023 to use the EEU system; - Registration lists of all five project countries were reviewed against the eight FAO/WHO criteria defining Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHP). In each country, active ingredients qualifying as HHPs are still in use. In a follow-on step, the initial draft of a HHP Risk Reduction Plan was developed for Tajikistan and work started on identifying alternatives allowing phase out of some selected HHPs in use in all five project countries (shortlisted HHPs to substitute are: alpha cypermethrin used for controlling aphids in cotton, thiacloprid used against chewing insects on apples, linuron used in cumin production); - Azerbaijan/Türkiye: A study tour was organised for an Azerbaijani delegation to study the Turkish pesticide registration system and attached QR-code system to track pesticide containers from import/production to the end user. As a result of the visit, MoAF of Türkiye will provide assistance to develop similar systems in Azerbaijan; - In Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, work started in 2Q/2023 to better understand farmer level pesticide exposure (data will be gender-disaggregated); -Kazakhstan: A training was held on PPE use and correct pesticide spraying on 30 March 2023; - Thirteen handbooks and guidelines related to agricultural practices relying on less and less dangerous pesticides were developed resp. translated into Turkish, Russian, and/or Azerbaijani (for more details, see project website).	S
Outcome 3: Farmers will use IPM alternatives to Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHP), and	a) Reduction in pesticide application frequency in four countries	Conventional pesticide applications do not consider pest pressures	Year 1: Data collected on conventional pesticide application rates	Year 4: 20 % reduction in pesticide application compared to convention	Output 3.2: IPM trials Azerbaijan: - An IPM baseline assessment was undertaken, IPM practices introduced in vegetable growing, technical guidelines developed. Harvest yield were evaluated in trial fields and showed to be highest in IPM fields; - To promote an understanding among the younger generation on the risk of pesticide use and available alternatives, work started to establish four schoolgardens in 2023 across the country. Kazakhstan: - IPM field trials started in 2023 in cabbage, tomato and apple.	HS

reduce pesticide application frequencies	Alternatives are not widely known so the only option considered is often pesticides	Year 2 - 3: Monitoring of pesticide use in target sites in all countries	al approach; reported to policy makers	<p>- Trainings for farmers organized connected to the trial sites on IPM and proper use of pesticides.</p> <p>- Development of National Action Plan for promotion of alternatives of HHPs started in 2023</p> <p>Kyrgyzstan:</p> <p>- IPM trials were undertaken in the period 2020-2022 (three seasons) in five key crops (corn, potato, sugar beet, wheat, kidney beans) on an area of 1.5 ha in the village of Studencheskoye (Sokuluk district) near Bishkek. 78 students from the Kyrgyz National Agrarian University (KNAU) participated in the field trials and learned IPM work on-the-job. The economic analysis of the comparison trials showed that traditional practices and IPM generated very comparable yields and profit margins, but IPM with less negative impacts due to reduced pesticide use.</p> <p>- Fertiliser trials showed a differentiated picture: Largest yield of beans and corn was obtained with one and a half norm of potassium and the use of 150 mg of organic fertilizer. For potatoes, highest yield was received with a double norm of potassium together with 200 mg of organic fertilizer.</p> <p>- Together with the field trials, KNAU also developed an IPM training curriculum for five crops (in Kyrgyz).</p> <p>- A national concept on promotion of rational use and reduction of pesticides and mineral fertilizers as well as promotion of alternatives to pesticides was drafted (National IPM Action Plan). The document resulted from a series of five working group meetings followed by two public round-tables. The feedback received was integrated into the final draft of the National IPM Action Plan. The plan was submitted to the government for comment and consideration.</p> <p>Tajikistan:</p> <p>- A potato seed bank based on IPM principles was developed in Tajikistan in 2020-2021. Average potato yield per hectare is 25 % higher in IPM fields and selected potatoes more resistant to potato late blight disease;</p> <p>- IPM trials in tomato, potato and apricot started in agricultural season 2023;</p> <p>- Development of a National IPM Action Plan started in 2023.</p> <p>Türkiye:</p> <p>- Three seasons of IPM trials on codling moth control were undertaken in apple orchards (2020-2022).</p> <p>In the first year, trials were conducted in the Isparta Fruit Research Institute's orchards to compare IPM, conventional and organic productions based on residue analysis and damage inspections. A five-day online training of trainers was held for 110 extension specialists to discuss IPM methods for controlling the main plant pests and diseases in Ankara. A 'Manual for Trainers on Integrated Pest Management in Apple Production' was developed and 35 extension specialists were trained on IPM. 8 leaflets were prepared and printed on different subjects like IPM basics, IPM in codling moth, IPM in apple scab and organic production, empty container management and so on. 200 fruit producers participated in an outdoor training/visit programme and two large meetings were conducted to inform 66 local producers about the results of the trials.</p> <p>In the second year, the trials were expanded to 70 ha of apple orchards tended by 30 beneficiary farmers in Isparta, They were supported by season-long trainings. Another 80 local producers were informed on IPM in apple production. In June 2021, a training of trainers on increasing marketability of low-input apple product was held in Isparta for 40 representatives of local stakeholders.</p> <p>The third season involved 46 new beneficiary apple producers with almost 90 ha of apple orchards.</p>
--	---	--	--	---

					<p>90 000 pheromone dispensers were distributed. 120 local producers were trained during field days on IPM and results and experience were shared to further promote IPM;</p> <p>Pesticide use against codling moth could be reduced on average by 70 % (with some farmers using no pesticides at all). Economic analysis shows that costs for the IPM and conventional approach are comparable; less labour is involved in the IPM approach; products can be obtained with no residue risks; and pheromone dispensers do not build a harmful legacy for the future by damaging the environment or building up pesticide resistance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A meeting with beneficiary farmers on 14 June 2023 showed that they are actively up-taking the IPM practices and paying for the pheromone dispensers themselves, not the least because they are aware of the health risks related to pesticide use; but also because pheromone dispensers can be hung by women farmers, unlike pesticide spraying, which is done mainly by men; and pheromone dispensers work efficiently also in high trees, where it is difficult to apply pesticides; - IPM approaches to control apple scab started in 2022; - The evaluation of the 2020-2022 data showed that the reduced use of pesticides for codling moth control, however, led to an increase of other apple pests. In response, the SP is to develop in 2023 a holistic approach balancing control of the most important apple pests with minimum pesticide use; - Trainings were held for direct marketing of low-input agricultural products to generate additional benefits for farmers for using healthy production practices; - In order to share and raise awareness among producers on the results and to promote IPM in the region, closing events were organized in 2021 and 2022. Representatives from different stakeholder groups such as apple producers, Isparta Provincial Directorate, Egirdir District Directorate, and the Fruit Research Institute of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry actively participated in the events. Also, a video showing the work with pheromone dispensers in the Isparta apple orchards was developed in 2021 (https://youtu.be/HbfSq6OZ7UA). 	
	b) Pest and disease prevalence data used to inform extension service advice	<p>Pest and disease monitoring is not a standard practice to guide decision and advice for treatments</p> <p>The availability of advice to farmers is rather low in most countries</p>	Year 2: National training of at least 10 extension agents per country	Year 3 - 4: pest monitoring data entered in forecasting models and extension advice provided to farmers	<p>Output 3.1: Pest and disease monitoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline assessment of existing pest surveillance systems were undertaken in Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. All countries show a need to strengthen pest surveillance; • A Technical webinar on Pest Surveillance for Sustainable Agriculture was held on 25 February 2021 (116 participants); • A study of the impact of climate change on 20 crop pests in the countries of the FAO REU region was published in 2021: https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb5954en. The report provides important input to understand how agricultural systems must be adapted to climate change without resorting to increased pesticide use. 	S

		c) Farmers applying IPM methods and familiar with alternative pest control methods	TCP project data on farmer practices in preparation The use of IPM as an alternative to conventional pesticide spraying by farmers is limited or not practised in all countries	Year 1 – 2: Continuation of existing TCP FFS and monitoring of trained and untrained farmers	Year 3-4: At least 50 % of trained farmers apply IPM in their own fields	Output 3.3: IPM promotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collection of data of the various IPM trials ongoing in order to quantify and synthesise results at end of 3rd/4th trial season; Producer's guidebook developed, which includes suggestions on farm management, agroecological practices as well as suggestions on specific requirements for each crop and for disease and pest management. Guidebook under final FAO internal review before clearance. In Türkiye a meeting with beneficiary farmers on 14 June 2023 showed that they are actively up-taking the IPM practices and paying for the pheromone traps themselves. In 2023, all 46 farmers participating in the 2022 trials continued to use pheromone traps, and they estimated that another 100-150 fellow farmers had switched to the new practices after seeing the trial results of the last years. 	S
Outcome 4: Project results are shared between project countries and outside stakeholders	a) Number of project monitoring reports as per requirements	None		Year 1: 1 PIR, 2 progress Year 2: 2 PIR, 4 progress, 1 MTR	Year 3: 3 PIR, 6 progress, 1 MTR Year 4: 3 PIR, 7 progress, 1 final report, 1 MTR, 1 Evaluation	Output 4.1: Project monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four PIRs submitted (including this one); Mid-term evaluation finalised, related management response submitted; Finance and activity tracking tools in place. 	S
	b) High level commitment from countries to life cycle management	Technical officers promote life cycle management but face weak involvement and support from decision makers			Year 3: High level representatives of all countries attend PSC meetings Year 4: 5 roadmaps for life cycle management published	Output 4.2: Lessons learnt shared <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three PSCs held. Trainings on safeguarding and the gender dimension of pesticide use were provided in the frame of the 2nd PSC. During the 3rd PSC, participants were introduced to the Turkish pesticide registration system and the related QR-code system to track pesticide containers. An overview was given on Türkiye's IPM work and the project's IPM trial orchards could be visited, including testimonials from beneficiary farmers. Also, two facilities producing beneficiary pests were visited; Project website operating; Eleven FAO guidelines were translated into various project languages (see project website); leaflets on risks by obsolete pesticides in Tajikistan and on collection of empty pesticide packaging in Türkiye published; report on climate change impacts on crop pests published; books for children on pesticide risks and alternatives to pesticides published (in English, Turkish, Azerbaijani); information videos about IPM practices in Türkiye developed and published on Youtube; four webinars held; Various technical reports published: regional risk reduction and disposal strategy for obsolete stocks; three legal baseline assessments; three national assessments of CMS and APW baseline; regional strategy for container management; gender, socio-economic and health dimensions of pesticide use and management; regional study on impact of climate change on pest; three assessments 	S

					<p>of national pest surveillance systems; draft regional IPM strategy; HHP assessment in all five countries; Azerbaijan National Profile for the Rotterdam Convention;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A project leaflet (in English, Russian and Kazakh) and Yearbooks 2021 and 2022 describing progress under the project in each country were published. The Yearbooks target national stakeholders and a wider audience; - FAO work on IPM and results of the apple orchards IPM field trials were presented 17-20 November 2022 at the 6th Biocidal conference in Antalya, Türkiye; - In the frame of World Soil Day on 6 December 2022, a webinar on HHP and contaminated soil management brought together 59 participants from 4 continents; - In the frame of the 14th HCH & Pesticide Forum, a special session was organised dedicated to the special challenges in the Central Asia region on contaminated soil and on solutions promoted by the project to introduce better life-cycle management. The Forum was also a good venue to exchange and receive latest information on best options to safely manage various hazardous agricultural wastes; - Various news pieces were published (see project website). 	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?

3. Implementation Progress (IP)

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

Outcomes and Outputs ¹²	Indicators (as per the Logical Framework)	Annual Target (as per the annual Work Plan)	Main achievements ¹³ (please avoid repeating results reported in previous year PIR)	Describe any variance ¹⁴ in delivering outputs
Outcome 1: 900 tonnes of POPs and obsolete pesticides are disposed of in an environmentally sound manner; and risks from obsolete stocks, contaminated sites and empty pesticide containers are further quantified and reduced				
Output 1.1 National Inventory of obsolete pesticides and associated wastes finalized in 3 countries	1) Tonnes of identified stocks entered and validated in PSMS <i>(note: PSMS is defunct since 2017)</i>	- AZE: Endorse inventory - KAZ: Start inventory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KAZ: Three out of 17 Oblasts have been inventoried in 2H/2022. Based on initial screening of historical data, 255 sites were visited. Only at 48 sites, OP could still be found, totalling 2.3 MT of solid and liquid pesticides and 98'634 m³ of piles with mixed pesticides and contaminated soil. Trainings of inventory teams were held in order to inventory the remaining Oblasts in 2H/2023. Tajikistan: Data from various regional inventories were consolidated to form a first national inventory. Main challenge in Tajikistan are not obsolete pesticides but the around 200 mini-landfills. 	
Output 1.2 Risk reduction and disposal strategy for sound management of obsolete and POPs pesticides completed	2) Number of EAs and EMPs adopted 3) Disposal capacity	- AZE: Finalise technical evaluation of co-processing option and reach a final decision in consultation with FAO HQ, National Counterparts & GEF - KAZ: Assess national options for POPs disposal - KGZ: Develop a national plan for safeguarding of OPs	- Export options investigated with negative result for all countries. Last confirmed in 2023 in communication between KGZ and China; - Azerbaijan: Following a meeting with Holcim Azerbaijan and Geocycle (the alternative fuels arm of Holcim) in Baku in September 2022 to discuss the benchmark results and the further way forward, a scientific-technical assessment of the probability of successful destruction of POPs pesticides in compliance with the Basel Convention Technical Guidelines at the Holcim Garadagh kiln was undertaken in 2H/2022. - Kazakhstan: Benchmarking of one cement kiln (JSC "Jambyl Cement", Vicat company) for its ability to co-process POPs wastes in compliance with the relevant Basel Convention Technical Guidelines was done in December 2022. While the plant is probably technically able to co-process POPs wastes (to be proven by a performance test), the country lacks legislation/regulations on high-temperature treatment of wastes. Treatment of hazardous wastes is to happen in a regulated space, hence, legislation should be developed as first priority; - Kyrgyzstan: A round-table was held on 20 April 2023 in Bishkek to discuss the development of a national strategy for OP management. The draft strategy should be finalised by end August 2023 and then submitted for stakeholder consultation.	
Output 1.3 900 MT of obsolete and POPs pesticides are safeguarded and disposed of in AZE, KGZ and	4) Tonnes of wastes a) safeguarded and b) destroyed	- AZE: Finish safeguard of 217 MT of OP at Jangi landfill. Improve landfill management. - KGZ: Plan for safeguarding and	- Azerbaijan: 210.342 MT of liquid POPs and other obsolete pesticides were safeguarded at the central Jangi landfill. Materials are now repacked in 11,402 UN-approved drums in a locked store building and awaiting disposal at a national disposal facility (export for disposal is not possible). MoA also asked for support to improve management of Jangi landfill. A questionnaire was sent to MoA to better assess their needs for improving landfill management and develop a more targeted training in 2H/2023; - Kyrgyzstan: Planning was initiated for the safeguarding of obsolete pesticides wastes at 26 sites. Discussions showed, however, that before safeguarding can start, 1-2 central stores need to be built first and several legal	-KGZ: OP management is widely unregulated and struggles with key issues like land and waste ownership and lack of quality waste management infrastructure. These issues

TJK		centralisation of unsecured OP at 26 sites -TUR: Safeguard and dispose of 10 MT of OP	questions resolved (e.g. on land and waste ownership). - Türkiye: Tender drafted for the safeguarding and disposal of 10 MT of obsolete pesticides, however, needs to be updated based on pending input from MoAF.	must be resolved before physical safeguarding and centralisation work can start.
Output 1.4 Risk associated with one critical contaminated site in one country is reduced	5) Rapid Environmental Assessment score for the site has reduced	- AZE: Investigate Ujar and Salyan sites - KAZ: Start phyto- and bio-remediation trials - KGZ: Continue bio-remediation trials - TJK: Work towards remediation of Village #1 site (site management plan confirmed, recipient site upgraded)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Azerbaijan: Initial site investigations of contaminated sites at Ujar and Salyan were undertaken. A national lab for analysing environmental samples was selected. It was decided to continue with a detailed site investigation and development of a site management plan for the Ujar site (ongoing); Kazakhstan: Tender for trials on phyto- and bio-remediation of POPs and heavy metals contaminated soils issued. Service Provider contracted, field and lab trials 2023 started; Kyrgyzstan: First phase of field trial of bio-remediation of soil contaminated with 19 different POPs pesticides shows substantial acceleration of decomposition process. Germination tests showed that soil vitality was improved and soil toxicity reduced. Laboratory trials with bacteria immobilising heavy-metals ongoing. A second phase LoA is under development aiming at closing knowledge gaps and further maturing this economic remediation approach for low-level contaminated soil; Tajikistan: Store annex able to host about 1'000 MT of obsolete pesticides and other materials built (inaugurated on 8 April 2023). In preparation of remediation of DDT-containing mini-landfill at Village #1, the 2018 detailed site investigation and related remediation plan were reviewed. Currently, tender for construction of soil cells at Vakhsh landfill and for the excavation of Village #1 mini-landfill is under development. 	- Azerbaijan: Some delays related to difficulties in identifying an analytical lab and need to identify a new NC.
Output 1.5 Container management capacity developed in the region and risks of empty containers reduced in AZE	6) Number of farmers (m/f) a) reusing containers and b) practising triple rinsing 7) Number of containers collected in AZE	- Development of CMS roadmaps in AZE, KGZ, TJK, TUR - Assess CMS baseline in KAZ - Prepare 2024 pilot projects in all project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various types of working group meetings were held in 2022/2023 to develop further national road maps for CMS. All five countries are developing now plans for pilot projects in 2024. In Tajikistan, emphasis is on developing legislation imposing an obligation to return/collect empty containers. Türkiye: 50 collection containers for empty pesticide packaging were provided for the Silifke region. The inauguration meeting was held on 2 June 2023, a leaflet (1'000 copies) explaining the risks related to improper disposal of empty pesticide packaging and how to use the collection containers was distributed. Assessment of CMS legal framework showed that regulation is widely absent in all countries. FAO plans to develop generic CMS regulations which can be used as a model. 	- Development of CMS concepts more time-consuming than anticipated due to the complexity of introducing such a process. - As empty container management is not an issue for AZE only, project strives to develop systems in all five countries (and not only in AZE as

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

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

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

		countries		per the original log-frame).
Output 1.6 High risk behaviours by exposed populations are quantified and reduced	8) Proportion of high risk populations practising high risk behaviours which expose them to obsolete pesticides	- KAZ: Establish NGO network on pesticide risk communication - TJK: Have awareness raising meetings on risks by OP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kazakhstan: Process of establishing a national network on pesticide risk communication is ongoing. The network should continue to work on pesticide risk communication beyond the life-time of this project. Tajikistan: Four awareness raising seminars on risks by obsolete pesticides were organised 8-11 November 2022. All four seminars together attracted about 140 participants from as various stakeholder groups as central, regional and local administrations and services, farmers, women's organisations, NGOs, Aarhus centre, etc. A leaflet and a poster were specifically developed for the four seminars. The overall number of printed leaflets (A4) and posters (100*70cm) is 1000 Tajik and 100 English copies, each. In addition, 200 A3 size posters (Tajik only) were printed. The materials can be accessed at: https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cc2765en (leaflets), and https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/CC2777EN (posters). 	
Outcome 2 Regulatory and institutional framework for pesticide management strengthened in five countries				
Output 2.1 Revised legal frameworks in line with the Code of Conduct developed	9) Number of identified non-conformances between national legislation and Code	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update AZE legal assessment - Present KGZ assessment - Undertake legal baseline assessment in KAZ - Develop Rotterdam Convention National Profiles for AZE and TJK 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Azerbaijan assessment report was updated in spring 2023 to include some recent legislative updates. National Profile needed for the ratification of the Rotterdam Convention developed based on a comprehensive assessment of Azerbaijan's legislative and institutional management of chemicals, including stakeholder consultations; Kyrgyz assessment report was presented on 20 April 2023 in the frame of a workshop in Bishkek; Kazakhstan legal assessment was finished by 2Q/2023; Tajikistan: Work for developing the National Profile needed for the ratification of the Rotterdam Convention started; Support was provided to the organisation of a regional meeting on the Rotterdam Convention (4-6 July 2023, Baku) with a view to further accelerate ratification by Azerbaijan and Tajikistan; Assessment of CMS legal framework showed that regulation is widely absent in all countries. FAO plans to develop generic CMS regulations which can be used as a model. 	
Output 2.2 Registration procedures and capacity strengthened by training and collection and consideration of field data on pesticide use and impacts + Output 2.3	10) Quality and comprehensiveness of data requirements for registration regulation in TAJ, TUR, and KAZ 11) Current and best case operator exposures quantified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop assessment of ongoing use of HHPs - Define national needs in developing registration systems - Baseline assessment on pesticide use, PPE, spraying 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Registration lists of all five project countries were reviewed against the eight FAO/WHO criteria defining Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHP). In each country, active ingredients qualifying as HHPs are still in use and a phase-out roadmap must be developed; - Kyrgyzstan: The country plans to develop an electronic registration and container tracking system. Three systems were evaluated for their (partial) suitability: System used by the Eurasian Economic Union, Turkish registration system, and FAO locust system. KGZ MoA decided in June 2023 to use the EEU system. - Azerbaijan/Türkiye: A study tour was organised for an Azerbaijani delegation to study the Turkish pesticide registration system and attached QR-code system to track pesticide containers from import/production to the end user. As a result of the visit, MoAF of Türkiye will provide assistance to develop similar systems in Azerbaijan; - Tajikistan: The initial draft of a HHP Risk Reduction Plan was developed; - Work started in 2Q/2023 on farmer level pesticide exposure assessments in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. Assessments are made based on digital questionnaires and focus group interviews. 	

Field data on PPE and spray operations is used to provide advice to farmers	12) Dissemination of results to extension advisors & farmers including # of publications/events	operations - Improving spraying practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Also work to identify alternatives to HHPs in use started in all five project countries (shortlisted HHPs to substitute are: alpha cypermethrin used for controlling aphids in cotton, thiacloprid used against chewing insects on apples, linuron used in cumin production); - Kazakhstan: A training was held on PPE use and correct pesticide spraying on 30 March 2023; - Kyrgyzstan: A training on better spraying practices for 400 agronomists is under preparation for delivery in 2H/2023; - Four FAO guidelines in Turkish were added to the FAO e-library and are accessible online (for more details, see project website). 	
Outcome 3 Farmers will use IPM alternatives to Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHP), and reduce pesticide application frequencies				
Output 3.1 Pest and disease monitoring to guide plant protection decisions in key crop(s) established in 3 countries (AZE, KGZ, TJK)	13) Number of advisors (m/f) trained and number of farmers participating 14) Frequency of pesticide applications reduced	- Prepare work on pest and disease monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kyrgyzstan: A training on pest and disease monitoring for 400 agronomists is under preparation for delivery in 2H/2023. 	
Output 3.2 Integrated pest management practices tested, validated and promoted to male and female farmers	15) Number of farmers (m/f) participating in IPM demonstration sites and applying methods in their own fields	- Develop national IPM action plans - Continue IPM trials	<p><u>Azerbaijan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To promote an understanding among the younger generation on the risk of pesticide use and available alternatives, work on establishing four schoolgardens across the country was initiated in early 2023; <p><u>Kazakhstan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First-year IPM field trials started in 2023 in cabbage, tomato and apple; - Trainings for farmers organized connected to the trial sites on IPM and proper use of pesticides. - Development of National Action Plan for promotion of alternatives of HHPs started in 2023 <p><u>Kyrgyzstan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IPM trials were undertaken in the period 2020-2022 (three seasons) in five key crops (corn, potato, sugar beet, wheat, kidney beans) on an area of 1.5 ha in the village of Studencheskoye (Sokuluk district) near Bishkek. 78 students from the Kyrgyz National Agrarian University (KNAU) participated and learned IPM work on-the-job. The economic analysis of the comparison trials in late 2022 showed that traditional practices and IPM generated very comparable yields and profit margins, but IPM with less negative impacts due to the reduced pesticide use; - Fertiliser trials in 2022 showed a differentiated picture: Largest yield of beans and corn was obtained with one and a half norm of potassium and the use of 150 mg of organic fertilizer. For potatoes, highest yield was received with a double norm of potassium together with 200 mg of organic fertilizer; - Together with the field trials, KNAU also developed in 2022 an IPM training curriculum for five crops (in Kyrgyz); - A national concept on promotion of rational use and reduction of pesticides and mineral fertilizers as well as promotion of alternatives to pesticides was drafted (National IPM Action Plan). The document is the result of a series of five working group meetings followed by two public round-tables. The feedback received was integrated into the final draft of the 	

			<p>National Action Plan. The plan was submitted in late 2022 to the government for comment and consideration.</p> <p><u>Tajikistan:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - First-year IPM trials in tomato, potato and apricot started in agricultural season 2023; - Development of a National IPM Action Plan started in 2023; <p><u>Türkiye:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Three seasons of IPM trials on codling moth control were undertaken in apple orchards (2020-2022). The third season involved 46 new beneficiary apple producers with almost 90 ha of apple orchards. 90'000 pheromone dispensers were distributed. 120 local producers were trained during field days on IPM and results and experience were shared to further promote IPM; - An analysis in late 2022 of the three years showed that pesticide use against codling moth could be reduced on average by 70 % (with some farmers using no pesticides at all). Economic analysis shows that costs for the IPM and conventional approach are comparable; less labour is involved in the IPM approach; products can be obtained with no residue risks; and pheromone traps do not build a harmful legacy for the future by damaging the environment or building up pesticide resistance. - A meeting with beneficiary farmers on 14 June 2023 showed that they are actively up-taking the IPM practices and paying the pheromone traps themselves, not the least because they are aware of the health risks related to pesticide use; and also because pheromone traps can be hung by women farmers, unlike pesticide spraying, which is considered men's work; and pheromone traps work efficiently also in high trees, where it is difficult to apply pesticides; - IPM approaches to control apple scab were going into a second trial season; - The reduced use of pesticides for codling moth control, however, led to an increase of other apple pests. In response, the SP is to develop in 2023 a holistic approach balancing optimum pest control with minimum pesticide use; - Trainings were held for direct marketing of low-input agricultural products to generate additional benefits for healthy production; - In order to share and raise awareness among producers on the results and to promote IPM in the region, a closing event was organized in December 2022. Around 40 representatives from different stakeholder groups such as apple producers, Isparta Provincial Directorate, Egirdir District Directorate, and the Fruit Research Institute of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry actively participated in the closing event. Also, a video showing the work with pheromone traps in the Isparta apple orchards was developed (https://youtu.be/HbfSq6OZ7UA). 	
<p>Output 3.3</p> <p>Quantify and promote the benefits of IPM and alternatives to HHPs, to farmers and pesticide management decision-makers</p>	<p>16) Profit, pesticide use and exposure comparison for trained and untrained farmers</p> <p>17) Dissemination of results and experience</p>	<p>- Collect data to prepare synthesis report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A producer's guidebook was developed, which includes suggestions on farm management, agroecological practices as well as suggestions on specific requirements for each crop and for disease and pest management. The Guidebook is under final FAO internal review before clearance. - Through comparison trials data collected on pesticides use and economical cost analysis of conventional plant protection and IPM in Türkiye, in Kyrgyzstan and data collection started in Kazakhstan. 	
<p>Outcome 4 Project results are shared between project countries and outside stakeholders</p>				

Output 4.1 Project monitoring system fulfils all applicable donor and stakeholder reporting requirements	18) Quality and timely project reports 19) Midterm and final evaluation reports		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Third PIR submitted; - Management response to Mid-term Review approved by the 2nd PSC meeting and submitted in July 2022; - Finance and activity tracking tools in place. 	
Output 4.2 Project evidence and lessons are taken into consideration in pesticide and agriculture policy-making, and widely disseminated to key national and international audiences	20) Number of high-level participants attending project events and meetings 21) Media coverage of publications and awareness materials	Hold 3 rd PSC meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Third PSC meeting held 13 June 2023 in Antalya, Türkiye. - During the 3rd PSC, participants were introduced to the Turkish pesticide registration system and the related QR-code system to track pesticide packaging. Also, an overview was given on Türkiye's IPM work and the project's IPM apple orchard could be visited, including testimonials from beneficiary farmers. Participants could also visit a pesticides sales shop, where the functioning of the container tracking system was demonstrated. Also, two facilities breeding beneficial insects used for biological pest control and for pollination in greenhouses, respectively, were visited; - FAO work on IPM and results of the apple orchards IPM field trials were presented 17-20 November 2022 at the 6th Biocidal conference in Antalya, Türkiye; - Project website operating; - Five FAO guidelines were published in Turkish; - Flyers on risks by obsolete pesticides in Tajikistan published in Tajik and English; - Flyer on CMS and collection of empty pesticide packaging published specifically for the Silifke region (Türkiye); - Kid's Book (book for children on pesticide risks and alternatives to pesticides) published in Azerbaijani; - Report on HHP assessment in all five countries drafted; - Yearbook 2022 describing progress under the project in each country was published. The Yearbooks target national stakeholders and a wider audience; - In the frame of World Soil Day, on 6 December 2022 a webinar on HHP and contaminated soil management brought together 59 participants from 4 continents; - In the frame of the 14th HCH & Pesticide Forum, a special session was organised dedicated to the special challenges in the Central Asia region on contaminated soil and on solutions promoted by the project to introduce better life-cycle management. The Forum was also a good venue to exchange and receive latest information on best options to safely manage various hazardous agricultural wastes; - Various news pieces were published (see project website). 	

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)

Key progress per component includes:

- Component 1: The first ever national inventory started in Kazakhstan. Initial results indicate that there are almost no obsolete stocks left needing safeguarding, however, the main challenge will be to address very large volumes of contaminated soil. This is a similar situation to Tajikistan, which mainly has to find an answer how to manage its approximately 200 mini-landfills. The project provided initial support by finalizing the remediation plan for the Village #1 mini-landfill and building a store which can host the excavated pesticides. More support will be provided to build up national capacity. Safeguarding of the polidofen stock at Azerbaijan's Jangi landfill ended (210.342 MT), and a national disposal option (co-processing at Garadagh cement kiln) has been identified a technical report prepared. Initial positive results on phyto- and bio-remediation could provide until project end an approach how to deal with the very large volumes of slightly, though above human health levels, contaminated soils and return them to safe agricultural production. Work has also triggered in the countries interested to develop national strategies how to manage the risks arising from legacy as well as annual pile of hazardous and non-hazardous agricultural wastes.
- Component 2: A key development was the request for support by Azerbaijan and Tajikistan for their ratification of the Rotterdam Convention. Also, the HHP assessment report showed that all countries are still using highly dangerous pesticides. Work to develop risk management plans and substitute some of these HHPs started. Also, a farmer level exposure assessment will provide a better understanding on current spraying practices and the (non-)use of PPE. With support by the Turkish MoAF, work on establishing/improving pesticide registration systems started.
- Component 3: Multi-year trials showed the feasibility of IPM to substantially lower pesticide use while producing same or better quality crops. Capacity development of farmers and national professionals are done, ongoing on IPM and pesticides use. Missing is, however, still a market understanding the benefits of healthier production and ready to pay a mark-up, thus more work is needed with farmers on direct marketing. Also, National IPM Action Plans are/were developed, which should have a longer-term impact, same as with the start of schoolgarden work in Azerbaijan.
- Component 4: The project website is operating and being regularly updated, and a multitude of information materials FAO guidelines were developed and translated into various project languages.

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 rating¹⁵	FY2023 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons¹⁷ justifying the ratings for FY2023 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	S	S	Tangible results have been achieved under all Components and with the project extension granted one year ago, the project should be able to introduce new approaches for better agricultural production reducing the use levels of pesticides, while at the same time providing the governments with tools to safer manage the various hazardous and non-hazardous agricultural wastes.
Budget Holder	S	S	<p>The project has achieved a budget delivery rate of 45 %, displaying good results both at national and regional components. The team's efforts have yielded positive outcomes on both the national and regional fronts. While minor delays have occurred, the scheduled activities remain on course. The project management is strong and there is well-established communication between FAO and project executive partners, leading to steady advancements towards the project's intended outcomes.</p> <p>Throughout the project's implementation, the team has encountered various external risks, which they have adeptly navigated. Some of these challenges include: (a) price fluctuations due to inflation; (b) regular management staff changes in the key ministries and partner organizations, as well as structural changes in Government organizations; (c) exchange rate and currency conversion challenges in procurement process etc. The project team demonstrated flexibility, applied adaptive management principles with technical and operational solutions, and addressed these risks effectively.</p>
GEF Operational Focal Point¹⁸			(Note: No ratings could be received from the OFPs in the time available for various reasons like staff changes in the ministries, long response times (months) while following official procedures, pressing priorities in ministries, etc.)

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

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

¹⁷ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

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

Lead Technical Officer¹⁹	S	S	The project is on track. Component 1 remains challenged while components 2,3 and 4 are implemented well, Highlighting good progress in component 4. For the remaining period, the project is intensifying efforts to achieve most of the outputs and provide countries with tools and instruments for pesticide management to ensure sustainability beyond the project's lifetime.
GEF Technical Officer, GTO (ex Technical FLO)	S	S	The project has been providing a lot of critical support to the beneficiary countries in all its intended areas of work. A lot of additional work remains for the short period of time until the completion of the project duration (end of 2024); so intensified efforts will need to be spent to achieve project's targets as formulated in the agreed workplan.

¹⁹ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

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				
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
Risks related to safeguarding, transport and disposal of obsolete pesticides were considered “High” at time of endorsement of project.	Undertake work according to best international practices	Risks during safeguarding of 210 MT of POPs pesticides at Jangi landfill (Azerbaijan) were mitigated by using an experienced international contractor who developed an HSE plan reviewed by FAO and submitted to AZE government. Safeguarding staff has been trained by the international contractor. FAO had an international consultant overseeing safeguarding work independently.	None.	None.
		Benchmarking of national disposal options is done against standards set forth in the relevant Basel Convention Technical Guidelines.	Performance test (trial burn) needs to be undertaken to demonstrate the national environmentally sound disposal option.	National government as the permit provider
		Work for contaminated soil and landfill management is done in line with relevant Stockholm and Basel Convention Guidelines.	Best practices need to be trained and introduced in countries	LTO, STA, ICs, service provider
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
ESS 7: Decent Work				

ESS 8: Gender Equality				
None.	None.	The regional report on the gender, socio-economic and health dimensions of pesticide use and management in Central Asia and Türkiye shows that in general women in the Central Asia region have less access to information on safe spraying practices and PPE selection and use.	Information provided by the report will be used when designing trainings on better spraying practices and PPE use.	
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

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

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

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.

None received.

²⁰ **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 ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
1	Project agreement with FAO will not be signed in different countries in a timely manner and season-sensitive activities such as inventory field work and cropping systems are unavoidably delayed to Year 2	Medium	Yes		All countries have joined the project and are actively participating.	
2	Lack of disposal options in the Central Asia Region means that safeguarded stocks will not be able to be finally disposed	Medium	Yes	1) Export wastes for disposal abroad. 2) Identify national disposal options which can provide environmentally sound disposal in compliance with the standards set forth by the Basel Convention Technical Guidelines.	Re. 1) Export options were repeatedly investigated, with negative result. Re. 2) In AZE, a national disposal option has been identified, which has a high potential to provide environmental sound disposal in compliance with the standards set forth by the Basel Convention Technical Guidelines. Final proof still needs to be provided by a performance test. A potential national disposal option has been identified in Kazakhstan, however, key obstacle for continuing work is the absence of regulations on thermal treatment of hazardous wastes. National disposal options in Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan will be evaluated by related UNEP project GEF ID 9421.	

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

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
3	Political instability in project countries	Medium	Yes	To reduce risks of work stalled due to a paralysed government, work should also be carried out through universities and other actors independent from government.	IPM trials are done mainly in collaboration with research and academic institutions. Safeguarding and disposal work is done through Service Providers. CMS work aims at involving crop protection industry as a process driver.	
4	Contradiction between national and international legislation/ standards; and between ministries	Low to Medium	Yes	FAO legal assessment defined gaps in existing legislation and made suggestions for harmonisation with international standards. Certain topics are hardly covered by legislation (CMS) and model regulations should be developed by FAO for further adaptation by countries.	Gaps of current legislation against the Code of Conduct have been defined and model legislation to close gaps will be developed for the further use by the countries. Model legislation on CMS will be drafted by FAO LEG.	
5	Lack of technical capacity (personnel and equipment) in project countries, including staff mobility	Medium	Yes	Provide countries with guidelines and relevant trainings. Activities in the countries are to include considerations of how to create national sustainability.	The project's PSCs were used as an opportunity to provide countries with information and trainings on safeguarding, pesticide registration, IPM. Bio-remediation trials shall mature an approach which is economic and low-tech to address the huge volumes of contaminated soil. Inspection of spraying equipment shall be strengthened in Türkiye through development of a mobile inspection system. Also, alternatives to the use of HHP are under development. A training module on better landfill management is under development.	
6	Objections and non-cooperation with disposal activities by governments and civil society in project and transit countries.	Low to High	Yes	Highest risk of dissent on disposal options in Kyrgyzstan. Preferably, a national dialogue on waste management will be established to ensure better understanding across stakeholder groups and work towards a national consensus. Also, other countries will be engaged early in development of disposal strategies to ensure buy-in.	Establishment of a National Dialogue in Kyrgyzstan discussed with ministries. Community involvement ahead of testing co-processing is a key consideration. Keep close cooperation with UNEP DDT project as well as civil society and Government.	
7	Insufficient funds for safeguarding of major contaminated sites, the disposal of POPs and other project activities.	High	Yes	Funds for safeguarding/ remediation will always remain insufficient until governments commit funding and develop cost covering schemes for legacy wastes. Support will be provided to develop such mechanisms.	Topic regularly addressed in meeting with governments.	

	Type of risk	Risk rating ²¹	Identified in the ProDoc Y/N	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions	Notes from the Budget Holder in consultation with Project Management Unit
8	Accidents and exposure during safeguarding, transport and handling of wastes and empty containers.	Medium	Yes	Only experienced waste management companies adhering to best international practices and with a proven track record are eligible to participate in safeguarding/disposal tenders. These companies are to provide trainings to national teams before start of work to lower risks, ensure adequate supervision during work, but also build up national capacity and experience.	Safeguarding work in Azerbaijan is undertaken by experienced, international waste management company. Work is supervised by FAO international consultant and FAO AZE representatives. Work on contaminated site remediation is prepared by an IC with 30 years of field experience.	
9	Lack of awareness about OP problems among populations and decision makers.	Medium	Yes	Awareness raising activities are to be undertaken in parallel to IPM resp. safeguarding work.	Information campaigns were held in Tajikistan and continuation is planned in Tajikistan and Kazakhstan.	
10	Climate risks such as heavy winters and hot summers, crop calendars disruption or increase of pest invasions.	Medium	Yes	Seeds and cultivation methods adapted to the climate zone must be selected.	Study on impact of Climate Change on pests and diseases published, which provides directions on mitigation options.	
11	Low existing use and uptake of alternative technologies by producers.	Medium	Yes	Change agents like NGOs or farmer associations will be involved to ensure sustainability and to multiply uptake. Advantages of alternative technologies are documented and information shared.	Farmers involved in apple orchard trials in Isparta, Türkiye, have expressed their will to take up the newly introduced IPM methods. In 2023, experience shall be also shared with farmers from other regions of Türkiye.	
12	Slow down or inability of implementing some activities due to Covid-19	High	No	FAO is following country rules with regard to social distancing and travel. As many training formats as possible are revised so that they can be held by zoom.	Covid-19 restrictions have been lifted in all project countries.	

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	The nature and incidence of risks identified during project formulation has in general remained unchanged. Mitigation measures are implemented. All activities are of an innovative nature and ask national partners to change traditional approaches. Intensive discussions are needed to ensure the needed buy-in. While stakeholders show interest in the approaches promoted by the project, project risks still remain moderate for the time being.

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: The MTR recommends a no-cost extension of the project until at least December 2024, in order to make it possible for the project team and the executing partners to achieve the project outputs and outcomes and capitalize on all the preparatory work done so far. For Kazakhstan, it is necessary to have additional discussions between the government counterparts and FAO on short notice as in this country all activities still need to be implemented (accelerating/intensifying activities, running activities in parallel, preparation of a follow-up project). No cost extension, jump-start work in KAZ	Extension approved on 28 June 2022 by 2nd PSC in Baku, Azerbaijan. Extension is granted until 31 December 2024.
Recommendation 2: FAO to ensure that communication, coordination and regular flow of information with (and between) national stakeholders of the project become more structured, and the functioning of the PSC is strengthened. Strengthen communication, coordination and regular flow of information	With lifted Covid-measures, travels to countries are again possible. This makes direct briefings and discussions with government counterparts possible. 2nd and 3rd PSC were held in person. Yearbooks 2021 and 2022 published. Project website operating. National Team Leaders (NTLs) ensure exchange and collaboration among national stakeholders and information flow.
Recommendation 3: FAO to ensure that methodical/strategic communication and awareness raising/outreach strategies are prepared (that considers increasing rural women's (and children's) access to knowledge and participation in project activities) and implemented. Prepare methodical/strategic communication and awareness raising/outreach strategies	Publication of targeted, understandable information materials increased. Vacancy announcement for a position on pesticide risk communication has been posted.
Recommendation 4: FAO to ensure that (exit) strategies (including elements on what will happen after project end) and national action plans will be agreed with the government counterparts, to ensure sustainability and upscaling of project results. Ensure exit strategies ensuring sustainability and upscaling of project results	Development of an exit strategy and initial discussions with governments are part of the project work plan 2023.
Recommendation 5: FAO to keep ensuring that all activities are in-line with relevant national and international rules and regulations. For this reason, conduct due diligence prior to major activities of the project (safeguarding, transport, temporary storage and disposal). Ensure all activities are in-line with relevant national and international rules and regulations.	Company safeguarding obsolete pesticides at Jangi landfill (Azerbaijan) works according to best international practices. Work is supervised by FAO international consultant and FAO AZE representatives. Assessment of national disposal options are made against the relevant Basel Convention Technical Guidelines and using consultants working with best international practices.
Recommendation 6: Align the separate national inventory studies in the region and put all data into a common database in a systematic manner	Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan inventories were reviewed by respective governments. Kazakhstan inventory is done using Kobo app, which

(as the project will not be able to resolve all issues and a well-organized database may be useful in future projects in the region). Ensure agreement of the relevant ministries with the inventories conducted. Insert all inventory data into a common database. Ensure agreement of the relevant ministries with the inventories conducted.	automatically inserts data into a database for further processing. Discussions are ongoing with FAO HQ on re-establishing a PSMS database to store all country data in an unified manner.
Recommendation 7: FAO to focus on the disposal of 900 tonnes of obsolete pesticides. If this target cannot be achieved, the project should secure safeguarding of obsolete pesticides (of larger amounts than 900 tonnes) in UN-approved packaging, temporary storage in a licensed facility, and obtaining a letter of intent for completion of disposal from the government authority. If safeguarding is not possible, ensure at least safeguarding and centralisation of materials.	It is increasingly unlikely that the project can dispose of 900 MT until end 2024. However, there is still sufficient time to prove performance of national disposal options in Azerbaijan and eventually in Kazakhstan. That would enable countries to continue with disposal also beyond the project's lifetime. In Kyrgyzstan, no disposal option will be available until end 2024. Therefore, construction of 1-2 central stores is planned with ensuing safeguarding of as much as possible of the unsecured OP at 26 sites.
Recommendation 8: Considering the POPs disposal limitations in the region and the huge number of buried pesticides (leading to large volumes of contaminated soil) in all project countries except Turkey, it is recommended that the project focuses more on upscaling of the bioremediation trials, potentially through promoting commercialization of these technologies in project countries. Focus on upscaling of bioremediation trials	Foreseen in Work Plan until project end.
Recommendation 9: Ensure life-cycle management of pesticides containers and Agricultural Plastic Waste in demonstration projects rather than just collecting pesticide containers, and consider applying innovative circular solutions such as demonstrating pest-control services with "product as a service approach". Ensure not only collection, but also treatment and disposal of empty containers	Treatment and disposal are integral parts of any CMS. Pilot projects planned in 2024 should demonstrate all elements from collection to disposal.
Recommendation 10: Ensure that recommendations provided by the MTR gender consultant are implemented to increase gender mainstreaming in the project, including (additional) specific field studies on gender, identifying gender-disaggregated indicators, increasing awareness of the decision-makers on gender concerns, preparing a gender action plan, and regularly consulting a gender expert in the project. Ensure gender mainstreaming in the project	The exposure assessment study in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, which includes gender disaggregation, provides the information for developing tailored trainings to reduce various pesticide exposure risks by gender.

Has the project developed an Exit Strategy? If yes, please summarize

Development of an exit strategy is part of the Work Plan 2023.

8. Minor project amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines²². Please describe any minor changes that the project has made under the relevant category or categories and provide supporting documents as an annex to this report if available.

Category of change	Provide a description of the change	Indicate the timing of the change	Approved by
Results framework			
Components and cost			
Institutional and implementation arrangements			
Financial management			
Implementation schedule	Project has been extended until end 2024	28 June 2022	2nd PSC meeting in Baku (Azerbaijan)
Executing Entity			
Executing Entity Category			
Minor project objective change			
Safeguards			
Risk analysis			
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%			
Co-financing			
Location of project activity			
Other minor project amendment (define)			

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

9. Stakeholders' Engagement

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

Stakeholder name	Type of partnership	Progress and results on Stakeholders' Engagement	Challenges on stakeholder engagement
Government Institutions			
Isparta Fruit Research Institute	Undertakes IPM trials in apple orchards in Türkiye	Works in an exemplary manner with fruit producers by involving key figures in the local community to establish contact between the Institute and single farmers, establish trust to participate in the trials, and ensure transfer of knowledge.	
Tajik Committee of Environmental Protection	Governmental counterpart for activities in Tajikistan	Good collaboration and interest and support by the government counterpart.	Reaching a comprehensive understanding of technical and economic aspects of managing obsolete pesticides and related timelines will still need more exchanges. Also, there is a shortage of qualified staff, which creates obstacles for fast progress.
Turkish MoAF	Governmental counterpart for activities in Türkiye	Good collaboration and strong support by the government counterpart to share its experience with other countries in the region.	
Non-Government organizations (NGOs)			
NGO Peshsaf (Tajikistan)	Main partner for work on mini-landfills and pesticide risk communication	Good collaboration, NGO is centre of competence on contaminated sites management.	Experience of partner is not yet fully in line with best international practices on contaminated sites management.
Manas University (Kyrgyzstan)	Main partner for work on bio-remediation of contaminated soil	Good collaboration, very motivated and involved partner	
Private sector entities			
Holcim Azerbaijan	Potential national disposal solution	The Holcim facility is interested in upgrading its facility, which already provides co-processing services, such that it can also co-process POPs-containing waste.	New stakeholders became over the last months part of the process (Geocycle (the alternative fuels arm of Holcim), GEF STAP).
Veolia Field Services	Safeguarding of obsolete POPs pesticides at Jangi landfill	Veolia is providing not only safeguarding services according to international standards but also supported the project with safeguarding training for participants of the 2 nd PSC.	

10. Gender Mainstreaming

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

Category	Yes/ No	Briefly describe progress and results achieved during this reporting period
Gender analysis or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages.	No	The Project Document mentions gender-sensitive activities, but no full-scale analysis was undertaken at the time of project formulation. In 2020/2021, the project has undertaken in four countries a study on the gender, socio-economic and health dimensions of pesticide use and management in Central Asia and Türkiye. A similar assessment is planned for Kazakhstan. Based on the findings of the gender assessment report, an action plan for mainstreaming gender in pesticide management and use will be developed by one international gender consultant and national specialists from each country. The project undertakes currently a pesticide exposure assessment study, which includes gender disaggregation and will be able to show the various pesticide exposure risks by gender and cropping systems.
Any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women's empowerment?		Three countries plan in gender considerations when preparing training and information activities, e.g. by adapting training times such that women with family obligations can still participate, ensuring that there is a balance between female and male trainers providing courses, developing questionnaires or interviews considering the specifics of a female or male audience, etc.
Indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality (as identified at project design stage):		
f) closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources		
g) improving women's participation and decision making		With regard to pesticide use, women have less access to information and PPE. The project intends to close this gender gap.
h) generating socio-economic benefits or services for women		
M&E system with gender-disaggregated data?		Currently not.
Staff with gender expertise		Training on gender was provided to staff. Hiring of gender consultants planned.
Any other good practices on gender		

11. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in Knowledge Management Approach approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval during this reporting period.	
Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.	The project does not have a dedicated knowledge management strategy. Key outputs are currently collected by STA and both uploaded to FPMIS as well as to the project team's shared disk. Materials are published on project website. Technical reports are shared with counterpart governments. GEF has requested project to document in detail all steps undertaken to assess, test and permit co-processing for POPs-disposal.
Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.	The project is striving to systematically attach communication activities to important and visible national and regional project events. Four awareness raising seminars on obsolete pesticide risks were held in November 2022 in Tajikistan, the seminars will be continued in 2H/2023. Specifically for the seminars, a flyer on risks by obsolete pesticides and protection measures was developed. For the 8 June 2023 inauguration event at Silifke (provision of 50 collection containers for empty pesticide packaging), a targeted flyer was developed informing on the importance of returning empty pesticide packaging and on the collection system established in the Silifke region. Also, project countries are updated regularly on project progress by the publication of the annual Yearbook and the project website is regularly updated, not only providing information on events, but also providing links to resource documents.
Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected Global Environmental Benefits. Please indicate any Socio-economic Co-benefits that were generated by the project. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.	Video from IPM trials undertaken in apple orchards in Isparta region, Türkiye, and related feedback by farmers on their experience with the use of pheromone dispensers instead of pesticides: https://youtu.be/HbfSq6OZ7UA
Please provide links to related website, social media account	https://www.fao.org/in-action/pesticides-central-asia/en
Please provide a list of publications, leaflets, video materials, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.	See project website. Project leaflet, latest version in Kazakh: https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/CC0589KK Leaflets on risks by obsolete pesticides in Tajikistan and on collection of empty pesticide packaging in Türkiye: https://www.fao.org/in-action/pesticides-central-asia/resources/leaflets/en Five FAO guidelines have just been made available in Turkish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management; http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/i3604tr • Guidelines for personal protection when handling and applying pesticides: http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/ca7430tr • Guidelines on Management Options for Empty Pesticide Containers: http://www.fao.org/3/bt563tr/bt563tr.pdf • Guidelines on Prevention and Management of Pesticide Resistance:

	http://www.fao.org/3/bt561tr/bt561tr.pdf <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Activity book – Healthy plants, healthy planet: https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/CA9327TR
Please indicate the Communication and/or knowledge management focal point's name and contact details	Ms. Birim Mor, birim.mor@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.

N/A

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

N/A

13. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²³	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval (USD)	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2023 (USD)	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team) (note by MTR team: amounts as per last PIR, until June 2021)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Nat. Gov.	Azerbaijan MoA	Cash	2,000,000	0	0	
Nat. Gov.	Azerbaijan MoA	In-kind	1,600,000	2,657,050	2,458,697	3,600,000
Nat. Gov.	Azerbaijan MoE	In-kind	1,400,000	0	0	1,400,000
Nat. Gov.	Kazakhstan MoA	In-kind	3,000,000	3,938,815	0	4,000,000
Nat. Gov.	Kazakhstan MoE	In-kind	--	116,219	--	--
Nat. Gov.	Kyrgyzstan MoA*	In-kind	650,000	895,000	770,000	900,000
Nat. Gov.	Kyrgyzstan SAEPF	In-kind	350,000	190,000	70,000	350,000
Nat. Gov.	Tajikistan MoA	In-kind	650,000	104,375	80,375	650,000
Nat. Gov.	Tajikistan MoA	Cash	--	--	--	--
Nat. Gov.	Tajikistan CEP	In-kind	350,000	395,721	21,131	400,000
Nat. Gov.	Tajikistan CEP	Cash	--	--	--	--
Nat. Gov.	MoA Türkiye	Cash	3,000,000	0	0	0
Nat. Gov.	MoA Türkiye	In-kind	3,300,000	100,289,130	47,066,716	110,000,000
GEF Agency	FAO FTTP, FTFP	Cash	10,000,000	348,559	15,858	10,000,000
GEF Agency	FAO TCP	Cash	2,400,000	1,715,534	1,459,331	2,400,000
GEF Agency	FAO Locust	Cash	7,000,000	5,341,151	4,234,737	7,000,000
GEF Agency	FAO Regular	Cash	600,000	0	0	600,000

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

GEF Agency	FAO 040	Cash	1,000,000	327,060	327,060	1,000,000
GEF Agency	FAO STDF	Cash	1,000,000	1,077,164	1,077,164	1,100,000
Bilat. Aid	Tajikistan EC	Cash	--	280,190	280,190	280,190
Bilat. Aid	Tajikistan JICA	CASH	--	160,400	160,400	160,400
Multilat. Aid	Tajikistan UNECE	In-kind	--	3,000	--	3,000
Multilat. Aid	Tajikistan UNEP	In-kind	--	5,000	--	5,000
NGO	Tajikistan various	Cash	--	313,150	257,650	400,000
TOTAL			38'300'000	118,157,518	58,279,309	144,248,590

* Numbers for Kyrgyzstan are only until June 2022. Newer numbers are not available due to governmental and ministerial re-organisations.

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development Objectives Rating. A rating of the extent to which a project is expected to achieve or exceed its major objectives.	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve 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
See separate Annex 2 Excel file with Geolocation information.				

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