



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019



1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Mozambique
Project Title:	Disposal of Persistent Organic Pesticides (POPS) and Obsolete Pesticides in Mozambique
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/MOZ/100/GFF
GEF ID:	3986
GEF Focal Area(s):	Persistent Organic Pollutants
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MASA), Ministry of Land, environment and Rural Development (MITADER)
Project Duration:	36 months

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	23 December 2010
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	07 August 2011
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	30 June 2014
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	31 December 2019
Actual Implementation End Date³:	

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	1,950,000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	4,254,836
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	1,198,115
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019⁵	4,254,836

¹ as per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

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

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

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	06 June 2019
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	October 2015
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	No
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	November 2018 – March 2019
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁶	Yes

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):	7 th PIR
--	---------------------

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

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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Khalid Cassam	Khalid.cassam@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Ivy Saunyama, AGPMC	Ivy.saunyama@fao.org
Budget Holder	Elisabetta Tagliati, AGPMC	Elisabetta.tagliati@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Kuena Morebotsane, CBC	Kuena.Morobotsane@fao.org

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Objective(s): To reduce the risks posed by POPs and pesticides wastes in Mozambique through the development of a national risk profile of contaminated sites and other POPs / pesticide contaminated materials. The project will result in the development of detailed site-specific waste management plans followed by the development and implementation of a national strategy for effective POPs waste management for existing and potential future wastes.						
Outcome 1.1: The containment and removal of buried pesticides at prioritized high risk locations so preventing continuing environmental contamination and public health risks	Site specific environmental management plans (EMPs) prepared and disclosed	11 contaminated sites identified		11 plans developed and disclosed by end of year 1	Complete. Screening analyses completed for 11 sites; intrusive samples at 5 sites only, due to higher than anticipated analytical costs; 3 sites selected by stakeholders and EMP and remediation plans completed.	S
	Tender for remediation of high risks sites awarded	Nil		Tender for disposal awarded and work completed	Combined tender for 2 of the contaminated soils and disposal of obsolete pesticides raised. Lot A (obsolete pesticides) contract awarded to Veolia, and lot B (contaminated soils) still under review	U

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

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

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

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					and negotiation.	
	At least 3 high risk sites remediated and disposal certificates issued in accordance with Basel Notification procedures	Nil		Wastes excavated and sent for disposal in accordance with site specific EMPs by end of year 3	To be done by contractor, but only 2 sites will be remediated.	N.A.
Outcome 1.2: The removal and safe treatment of all old pesticide containers produced as a result of implementation of past projects	Container treatment equipment delivered to Mozambique and commissioned	Nil		Completed by end of year 2	Cancelled. Due the heavy contamination (pesticides were solidified into the plastic) and large quantities of contaminated wastewater generated, the containers will all be disposed with the obsolete pesticide wastes. Containers in Nampula & Boane repacked.	=
	All containers treated and clean material entered into local recycling chain	Nil		Completed by end of year 3	See above	=

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
Outcome 2.1: The development of a sustainable system for container management in the future in collaboration with pesticide industry	Report on container recycling options for new pesticide containers published and disclosed	Nil		Completed by end of year 2	Study tour to Brazil (Mar 2013). A Container Management strategy document developed Sept 2014. Pilot project based on strategy document was planned for 2016/7 season	MS
	Pesticide regulation on container management submitted for government review and adoption	Nil		Completed by end of year 2	Cancelled Included in the Pesticide Management guidelines (Outcome 2.2)	N.A.
	Industry sector waste management plan for pesticide distributors prepared and submitted for review by govt	Nil		Completed by end of year 3	Cancelled Included in Hazardous Waste Management Strategy.	N.A.
Outcome 2.2: Institutional capacity will be developed and national pesticide management policy will be strengthened to ensure the risk to the environmental	Pesticide management guidelines published	Nil		Completed by end of year 3	8 Guidelines finalized and translated but not adopted or discussed yet by the Government because of a regional initiative in harmonizing the legislation.	MS

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
and public health from obsolete pesticides and associated wastes is minimized in the future	Waste management guidelines published	Nil		Completed by end of year 3	Consultant recruited; national assessment completed in Aug 2014. Waste management strategy draft prepared, but international consultant did not complete it. Due lack of funds the SC agreed to cancel this activity.	MU
Outcome 2.3: Improved management of pesticides imported into Mozambique for agricultural and public health uses through all stages of the pesticide life-cycle that institutionalization of the PSMS	Training certificates issued for all pesticide and customs inspectors	Nil		All completed in year 3	Training to be based on the new SADC Regional Pesticide Management Guidelines. Activity pending formal adoption of SADC Regional Pesticide Management guidelines (Outcome 2.2)	N.A.
Outcome 3.1: Monitoring and evaluation systems will be put in place to ensure project components are implemented	Monthly M&E reporting based on FAO component level M&E system. Reports entered onto project web page	Nil		All completed at project inception and thereafter	Cancelled by steering Committee in 2014	MS

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
effectively and efficiently. National staff will be trained in the application to allow their use in other projects	Health surveillance records (used to quantify if any pesticide exposure has occurred to workers)	Nil		Completed prior, during and post implementation of Outcomes 1.1. and 1.2 according to work plan	8 members of staff tested in 2014, prior to starting contaminated site remediation works. Additional medical check-up of the staff conducted in June 2015 to all staff (15 person).	S
	Training records available for inspection to ensure all staff are competent	Nil		Completed at project inception and reported thereafter.	National staff have been trained in the use of the M&E reporting system	S
Outcome 3.2: Project personnel from line ministries will be trained in the principles of project management which are applicable to a wide range of future challenges.	Component logical frameworks and critical path analyses approved and submitted as part of the annual work planning process	Nil		Completed at project inception and quarterly thereafter	Annual work plans developed and updated when needed. The co-financing UTF project was extended to end of December 2019 (including the containers under this GEF project).	S
	FAO 6-monthly reports completed and available for review	Nil		At project inception and every 6 months thereafter	Six month reports available for the years 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018. Annual PIRs available	S

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

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁷	Baseline level	Mid-term target ⁸	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating ⁹
					for 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017	

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
<p>Outcome 1.1: The containment and removal of buried pesticides at prioritized high risk locations so preventing continuing environmental contamination and public health risks</p>	<p>Speed up the process of procurement for Lot B tender</p>	<p>FAO HQ - AGPMC</p>	<p>Immediate</p>
<p>Outcome 1.1: The containment and removal of buried pesticides at prioritized high risk locations so preventing continuing environmental contamination and public health risks</p>	<p>Recruit international consultant for the preparation of the tender for Lot B (contaminated soils)</p>	<p>FAO HQ - AGPMC</p>	<p>30 July 2019</p>

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

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs ¹¹	Expected completion date ¹²	Achievements at each PIR ¹³					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ¹⁴ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th /6 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1 Site survey report for assessment of all contaminated site including analytical data and profiles for extent of contamination completed.	Q3 Y1	Rapid investigation of 15 site (4 new were identified during the investigation) and ranked					100%	The investigation showed that from the 15 sites 6 were crucial and need an intrusive investigation
Output 1.1.2 Site specific environmental management plans and remediation strategies developed	Q1 Y2		Samples of soils from 6 sites were collected and sent for analysis	5 EMPs prepared			100%	From the 6 sites, the Port Manager of the one that was located in Nacala port (without consulting anyone), removed all the soils from the port by hiring a truck and deposited them at a regular landfill. As a result, the fate of those soils is unclear.

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

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

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

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

<p>Output 1.1.3 Safeguarding and disposal contract for implementation of the EMPs resulting in excavation of buried pesticides and remediation of selected high risk contaminated sites using a combination of in-situ and ex-situ treatment options completed</p>	<p>Q3 Y3</p>		<p>Excavation in Lichinga hospital conducted and no pesticides were found.</p>	<p>Intrusive investigation concludes that the contaminated soils in 3 of the 5 sites where EMPs were developed are weighing more than 900 tons</p>	<p>Combine tender for remediation and disposal of OPs elaborated</p>	<p>Combine tender for remediation of contaminated soils of 2 sites and disposal of obsolete pesticides. Contract for Lot A (disposal of OPs) awarded and disposal of OPs in progress; Lot B (contaminated soil) tender cancelled and a new tender document prepared</p>	<p>80%</p>	<p>The 2 prioritized contaminated sites will be treated by a company (to which the tender will be awarded). (discussions in progress). Disposal activities and the co-financed project UTF/MOZ/107/MOZ</p>
<p>Output 1.2.1 Detailed inventory and risk assessment of all remaining obsolete pesticides and contaminated pesticide containers in Mozambique completed</p>	<p>Q2 Y1</p>	<p>Inventory completed but not loaded in PSMS</p>					<p>100%</p>	<p>The inventory was not loaded into the PSMS due to lack of stable internet at the Plant Protection Department. After the inventory it was concluded that the empty containers are not in condition to be locally treated due to heavy contamination and need to be exported together with the OP from the co-financed project UTF/MOZ/107/MOZ</p>

Output 1.2.2 Selection, procurement and commissioning of container decontamination and crushing / fragmentation equipment based on analysis of container inventory data	Q3 Y2							Since the empty containers will not be treated locally, no equipment was procured for local processing of empty containers. See comment above on output 1.2.1
Output 1.2.3 Recycling equipment operated (by a trained local team of five operatives) and contaminated containers treated	Q 4 Y3					Part of the empty container was sent for destruction with the OPs	10%	No functional empty container management system – see Outcome 1.2. Part of the empty container stored in Chimoio store was sent for destruction
Output 2.1.1 Consultant feasibility study on options for sustainable container management in collaboration with national pesticide industry and other stakeholders developed.	Q4 Y1	5 recycler company identified		Pesticide empty container strategy developed			60%	The country has no data about the volume of pesticide containers imported and this made the feasibility study to be impossible to do

<p>Output 2.2.1 A series of national operational technical guidelines on specific aspects of the pesticide life cycle including pesticide registration, pesticide storage, pesticide transport and container handling, developed and made available in English and Portuguese</p>	<p>Q4 Y1</p>	<p>Identification of the 8 subject of the guidelines</p>	<p>8 guidelines on pesticides management issue drafted</p>	<p>8 guidelines elaborate, discussed with the industry and public sector</p>	<p>8 guidelines translated into Portuguese to be sent to the Government</p>		<p>90%</p>	<p>Finalization of national Pesticide Management Guidelines was put on hold pending the ongoing review and approval process of the SADC Regional Pesticide Management Guidelines (through the Southern African Pesticide Regulators' Forum – SAPReF). The SC committee validated the decision to ensure sound alignment of the national pesticide management policy and guidelines with the regional guidelines and to avoid duplicating efforts.</p>
<p>Output 2.2.2 National waste management plan expanded to include aspects of pesticide waste management, and regulations related to the classification, identification, handling and disposal of pesticide wastes drafted for adoption</p>	<p>Q3 Y3</p>			<p>Consultancy for elaboration of the Hazardous waste contracted</p>			<p>40%</p>	<p>The consultant contracted did not perform his responsibility. Based on the fact that the co-finance project collected more than the expected volume of Obsolete Pesticide wastes and that the contaminated soils to be treated exceed 80 tons the Steering Committee agreed on cancel this activity</p>

Output 2.3.1 Installation of FAO Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS) as primary repository of data for pesticide registrations and tracking of pesticide distribution in the country	Q4 Y3						0%	The internet at Plant Protection where the Pesticide Registrar is housed is very weak and not reliable. Because of this, it was not possible to use the PSMS in the country. In addition, for some time PSMS has been under review by FAO and inaccessible to users.
Output 2.3.2 Pesticide inspectors and customs officials trained on identification of unregistered and / or illegal products	Q4 Y3							This activity will be implemented after the adoption of the pesticide management guidelines (beyond the lifespan of the project).
Output 3.1.1 Monthly independent M&E reports for each component comparing implementation status against initial work plan status completed and supplemented by quality assurance review	Q4 Y3							After the first National Steering Committee it was realized that monthly reporting was not feasible and they agreed to have and follow the normal project reporting system of FAO (the 6 month report, PPR and PIR), Mid-term and Terminal evaluations

Output 3.1.2 Health surveillance records (used to quantify if any pesticide exposure has occurred to workers)	Q4 Y3			2 Health surveillance made	2 health surveillance made		100%	The routine medical check-ups have been made under the co-finance project UTF/MOZ/107/MOZ
Output 3.2.1 Component logical frameworks and critical path analyses approved and submitted as part of the annual work planning process	Q4 Y3	Elaborated	Work plan revised	Work plan revised	Work plan revised	Work plan revised	80%	
Output 3.2.2 FAO ¼ and 6 monthly reports completed and available for review	Q4 Y3	2 report made	2 report made	2 report made		2 report made	80%	

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

Max 200 words:

During the reporting period, the main progress was the initiation of disposal activities, with the first activity being the packaging of the OPs for disposal. A total of about 62,5 ton was sent to the port of Beira, from Chimoio Store to be shipped to UK for disposal.

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

Max 200 words:

- Obtaining transit permits by the Government of the Republic of Tanzania (in line with the provisions of the Basel Convention) was a protracted challenge. However, with the intervention of the FAO Representative in Tanzania, the permits were granted after 6 months.
- The major challenge (resulting in the rating 'marginally satisfactory progress toward implementation') and high risk rating has been the tender for Lot B (contaminated soils). The tender for Lot B had to be cancelled due to complications with disposal options for the contaminated soils. It emerged that local disposal as it was advertised, was not an option anymore since the local landfill was no longer available. A new tender has to be developed based on feasible disposal options. Dialogue is ongoing with the Lead Technical Unit and it has been agreed to urgently recruit an international consultant to review the tender document for Lot B accordingly.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating¹⁵	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating¹⁶	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	<i>Even the fact the some activities of the project were deferred, this had a reason for that and it was well justified. The big issue is with the contaminated soils that the process are still on way but there are high risk that the same will not be completed before the end of the project,</i>
Budget Holder	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	<i>Good progress made with the disposal tender Lot B; remedial action in place to address challenges with Lot B (contaminated soils)</i>
Lead Technical Officer¹⁷	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	<i>For the review period, the outstanding activity has been the disposal. Good progress made with Lot A (obsolete stocks). Successful re-tendering for Lot B will ensure project achieves most of the major objectives.</i>
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately satisfactory	<i>Overall, risks posed by POPs and pesticides wastes have been reduced with the safe disposal of most of the stocks. Partners and the project team in Mozambique have to be commended. However, there is an important question on sustainability due to the fact that prevention subcomponents were not fully implemented.</i>

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

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

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

3. Risks

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

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ¹⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
Low	The risk of not taking any action with the contaminated soils is high. The identified contaminated sites within Mozambique have been a high or substantial risk for years, sometimes decades. The risk of doing nothing is unacceptable. The designation of sites for in situ and ex situ remediation will provide a responsible place for remediation, within the confines of adequate supervision and security.

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

Risk ratings

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

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
--	------	---------------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------------------------

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

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

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

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Larger than expected volumes of waste are found at each of the burial locations or additional sites are identified;	Low	The site characterization process will result in a risk based analysis of each location. The work plan for excavation will focus resources on those sites posing the highest risk to public health and the environment. Any additional work will require allocation of national budget or funding from another donor agency.	Not having extra funds, reduction of activities was decided by the Project Steering Committee	Confirmed. Extra 100 tons of OPs collected and safeguarded and identification of extra 800 ton of contaminated soils on the assessed sites. Some activities on the co-financed project UTF/MOZ/107/MOZ were reduced and as a result some activities were not implemented. It is important to mention that the government and FAO tried to get funds from other donors without success. It is anticipated that new projects can be designed to continue with the operation focus more in creating local capacity to strengthen management of pesticides to prevent further accumulation and also to deal with the disposal e.g. of empty containers and contaminated soils.

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Risk of environmental contamination from POPs and other obsolete pesticide soils during safeguarding, transportation and remediation operations	Low	<p>The 11 identified contaminated sites within Mozambique have been a high or substantial risk for years, sometimes decades. The risk of doing nothing is unacceptable. The designation of sites for <i>in situ</i> and <i>ex situ</i> remediation will provide a responsible place for remediation, within the confines of adequate supervision and security. Any accidental spillage or cleaning of transport vehicles will be treated according to best practice.</p> <p>For contaminated sites deemed too phyto-toxic to remediate, UN approved shipping containers, labels and Best Management practices will be used to minimize handling and transportation mishaps.</p>	No action is being made so far	<p>This year Mozambique was ravaged by cyclone Idai that affected some areas where the project is working (have stores and contaminated sites). After the cyclone, the country experienced flooding, especially in Muziva where the worst contaminated site is located.</p> <p>It is important to mention that due to budget restrictions (inadequate funds), the project only anticipates to 2 most hazardous sites. However, is important to make a rapid assessment to check the level of contamination following recent flooding due to cyclone Idai.</p>

	Risk	Risk rating¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	Weather instability impacts on remediation sites	Low	The 11sites are exposed to the elements now, and subject to the movement of residues in ground and surface water. Lower residue sites selected for phyto remediation or other in situ treatments have minimal additional impacts on their surroundings. The treatment cells for higher concentration residues will be operated primarily in the drier months but will have emergency plans for drawing off excess water into holding areas in case of torrential rain.	Medium	Flood in Muziva area. Assessment of post flood needs. See comment on risk 2 above.
4	Natural disasters that impede access to sites or regions where pesticides were buried or pesticides containers are stored. This risk could seriously delay the project completion date.	Medium to Low	Related to Risk immediately above. High rainfall, rare cyclone, could interrupt the progress. Will have emergency plans for drawing off excess water into holding areas in case of torrential rain.	NIL	There was temporary restriction in the access to Muziva following cyclone induced flooding.
5	Project staff and public are exposed to pesticides	Low			Store in Chimoio had some leakage that created some smell in the surrounding area but the leakage was quickly remediated by the project team
6	Project coordination becomes ineffective due to lack of cooperation among institutions	Low		NIL	The cooperation is good
7	Quantities of pesticides residues found are much higher than estimated	Medium	A risk based prioritization procedure will be applied to ensure that work continues with maximum environmental and stakeholders benefits.	See risk 1	See risk 1

	Risk	Risk rating¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
8	Variable costs for equipment or services exceed budget allocations	Medium	The Budget Holder will monitor closely project expenditures. If prices rise, the scope of activities will be adjusted to prevent budget over-runs.	NIL	
9	Re-accumulation of stock of obsolete pesticides due to poor pesticide management practices	Low	The previous phases the project have resulted in a preliminary analysis of the pesticide management issues in Mozambique. FAO has also prepared a comprehensive project document for improved pesticide management which is currently under consideration by other donors. This will promote low input agriculture and so limit pesticide use in certain key crops if supported.	Collecting the new stocks and store them on the stores	The Min Agriculture in their post registration enforcement activities are confiscating obsolete pesticides, unwanted pesticides and illegal pesticides. They are sending these to the Obsolete Pesticides store although they have neither clear plan nor budget for their disposal. A clear strategy has to be elaborated to address this challenge.
10	Difficulties in recruitment of international consultants	Medium	The number of available international consultants in the subject areas detailed in this project document is limited. To ensure access to specific consultants in line with work plan requirements, this process will be carefully managed to prevent delays in project implementation.	NIL	

	Risk	Risk rating¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
11	Unavailability of adequately experienced national staff, lack of follow-up by policy-makers at high Government levels and local administrative bottlenecks	Low	The likelihood of impact on project implementation is considered at acceptable levels as authorities at the highest level in Mozambique have demonstrated a high commitment to this project and successful achievement of its objectives and to provision of all necessary support. Where ministry staffing is low, contract labour will be engaged.	NIL	
12	Equipment procured from domestic suppliers/through import is delayed	Medium	The National Project Coordinator will undertake to complete all necessary formalities to gain all necessary approvals and exemptions in this regard from the appropriate government institutions. Government obligations ensure that imports are received with minimum delays. FAO representation in Maputo will liaise with government counterparts to monitor this process and ensure efficient customs clearance of imports.	NIL	
13	The change on the PMU team that works under previous projects of inventory and disposal of obsolete pesticides can delay the implementation of the project due the new persons will need to be trained	Low	The highest Government levels have repeatedly demonstrated that they remain highly committed to see this project executed to successful achievement of its objectives and to provide all the necessary support including human resources.	NIL	
14	Unavailability of adequate experienced national NGO to ensure independent monitoring and supervision.	Low			

	Risk	Risk rating ¹⁹	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions ²⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
15	Lack of adequate incentives to national staff to participate in training courses and to implement disposal activities.	Low	Mozambique has demonstrated a long history of national resolve to remedy the challenges posed by POPs and other obsolete pesticides. No indication that this resolve is weakening.	NIL	
16	Not Awarding the contract for Lot B (Disposal of contaminated soils) due: 1) no agreement of landfill manager (Enviroserv) and landfill owner (Government) for the landfill at Mavoco 2) over problems of space at the landfill to accommodate all the contaminated soils in Mavoco	High	Identify feasible and cost effective disposal options for the contaminated soils; prepare new tender and award it.	Initial tender drafted; review and update a new tender to include regional or international disposal based on feasible and most cost effective options	This is a new risk and High risk that compromises the remediation of contaminated soils. Urgent action needs to be taken to identify feasible options to inform the new tender. The risk is high, especially in view of the short timeremaining till the end of the project

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Medium/High	Medium/High	There are high risks of Obsolete Pesticides (OPs) and contaminated sites not being completely disposed and/or remediated due the large quantities of both obsolete stocks and contaminated sites found and above the quantities budgeted for. The Obsolete Pesticides are being exported for disposal in UK. However, the currenttender does not cover the extra obsolete pesticides currently in the store. These are moslystocks arising from the Min Agric enforcing the legislation and collecting obsolete, unwanted, counterfeit and not registered pesticides and sending them to the OPs store. The Min of Agric stocks are not within the provision of the tender. In addition, the tender for contaminated soils if not awarded will pose a high reputational risk for the project and continue to pose risks to human health and the environment.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

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

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs	Yes	Tender for Lot B was not awarded due administrative problems between the Government and the landfill plant who are supposed to receive the contaminated soils. Discussions are underway for a new tender.

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	<p>Original NTE: 15/01/2014 Revised NTE: 31/12/2019</p> <p>Justification: This is a co-financed project. Initially delays in the implementation of the co-financed project UTF/MOZ/107/MOZ necessitated extension. In addition, delays in execution of project activities and procurement of good and services also made it necessary to seek extension. The disposal tender was delayed by almost 2 years.</p>

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

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

The project document did not specify any clear gender action plan.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

N/A

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

The Steering committee comprises various stakeholders from public and private sector including civil society.

The following stakeholders are part of the project stakeholders:

- Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security – Chair and project implementer
- Ministry of Land, Environment and Rural Development – Co-implementer
- Ministry of Health – Co-implementer
- Ministry of Finance (Custom Authorities)
- Ministry of Labor
- Ministry of Interior
- Research Institute
- Academia – Eduardo Mondlane University
- Private sector – Industry (Agrifocus and TECAP)
- NGO – Livaningo
- Farmer Association

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

This project and the co-financed project UTF/MOZ/107/MOZ, developed 5 radio spots that were broadcast in 12 national radios during 45 days. Those radio spots created awareness to the pesticide users and general to better understand risks when dealing with pesticides and how to better manage pesticide products to reduce the risks.

Farmers and extension workers were trained in the pesticide risk reduction.

Awareness raising was done through an NGO engaged by the project. The main target audience were the communities that live around pesticide stores and pesticides contaminated sites.

Two manuals related to sound pesticide management were produced jointly with another FAO project; printing in progress. These will be distributed to different stakeholders, including extension staff and farmers.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ²²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Nat'l Gov't	Gov. Japan	Grant	3,482,836	3,482,836	3,482,836	3,482,836
Nat'l Gov't	Gov. Netherlands	Grant	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
Bilat. Gov't	USAID	Grant	197,000	197,000	197,000	197,000
Local Gov't	Gov. Mozambique	Grant	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
Multilateral	FAO	Grant	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
		TOTAL	4,254,836	4,254,836	4,254,836	4,254,836

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

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

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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