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):	Eritrea
Project Title:	Prevention and Disposal of Persistent Organic Pollutants and Obsolete Pesticides in Eritrea Phase II
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP/ERI/014/GFF
GEF ID:	3987
GEF Focal Area(s):	POPs
Project Executing Partners:	Ministry of Agriculture with: Ministry of Land, Water and Environment; Ministry of Health
Project Duration:	42 months

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	30 June 2009
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	28 April 2011
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE[1]:	1 November 2012
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) [2]	30 October 2015
Actual Implementation End Date[3]:	30 June 2019

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	2,150,000
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc[4]:	3,209,153
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	1,929,158
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019[5]	2,465,468

[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:	16/08/2018
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	January 2016
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	May 2016
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:	December 2018
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required[6]	**Yes**

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status ***(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):***	7th 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	**Tekleab Misghina**, Regulatory Service Department. Ministry of Agriculture. **Kaleab Haile,** National Project Coordinator, Ministry of Agriculture. **Alganesh Ghebrekristos Berhe** (Programme Assistant – FAO Eritrea)	Tekleabketema@gmail.com Kaleab.haile@gmail.com AlganeshGhebrekristos.Berhe@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Elisabetta Tagliati, Agricultural Officer, AGPM	Elisabetta.Tagliati@fao.org
Budget Holder	Saeed Abubakar Bancie, FAO Representative in Eritrea	Saeed.Bancie@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Kuena Morebotsane, Technical Officer, GEF Unit	kuena.morebotsane@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: To eliminate risks from POPs and other obsolete pesticides in Eritrea through the use of sound environmental management methods to dispose of existing stocks and prevent further accumulation of POPs and obsolete pesticides.						
Outcome 1: Eritrea's existing stocks of POPs and other obsolete pesticides safely destroyed and strategies for the remediation of contaminated materials, including soils developed and demonstrated	Quantity (in tonnes) of POPs and other obsolete pesticides safely removed and disposed of	-400 tonnes of obsolete pesticides identified during project preparation -No recycling /disposal, and risk reduction strategies for the remediation of contaminated materials -During project preparation, 1500m3 contaminated soils, -16 tonnes contaminated materials, 53,000 empty containers and 5,411 contaminated sprayers identified		400 tonnes of obsolete pesticides safeguarded and destroy -Recycling/ local disposal strategy developed and demonstrated for 53 000 contaminated empty containers -Recycling/disposal strategy developed and demonstrated for 5 400 contaminated sprayers -Risk reduction strategy developed and demonstrated for sites with heavily contaminated soil and building materials (1500m3 contaminated	-363.98tonnes of obsolete pesticides were successfully disposed by high temperature incineration at a facility in Ellesmere Port, United Kingdom. -120 contaminated metal drums and stored them safely at Daeropoulos pesticide store. -No local capacity identified yet for recycling -Site secured for landfill for contaminated soils but resources insufficient for construction	HS S 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]
					(financial and time constraints, even for design of landfill).	
Outcome 2: Strengthened capacity for pesticide life-cycle management	New strengthened pesticide legislation adopted -Number of technical personnel trained on pesticide life-cycle management (IPM, Pesticide Stock Management System, Pesticide Risk Management and Regulation) - Number of farmers adopting IPM for citrus -% reduction in the volume of broad-spectrum pesticides used on citrus by participating farmers, compared to non-participating farmers and baseline -% improvement in citrus yields among participating farmers compared to non-	Review of pesticide legislation was undertaken and a new pesticide legislation drafted during project preparation -Responsible institutions have insufficient capacity to regulate and manage pesticides effectively – staff have not undergone training in pesticide life-cycle management -IPM is currently not used in Eritrea – 0 -Baseline to be established during inception phase -Baseline to be established during		New pesticide legislation finalized and adopted -At least 40 technical staff from Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Land Water and Environment trained on pesticide life-cycle management IPM for citrus adopted by at least 100 farmers by the end of the project 60 % reduction in the volume of broad-spectrum pesticides used on citrus by participating farmers	New pesticide legislation translated into Arabic and Tigrinya, validation workshop was also conducted. One MoLWE staff has graduated in the Post Graduate Diploma course in Pesticide Risk Management at the University of Cape Town South Africa Some 62 members of the MoLWE and MoA have been trained in pesticide management. 40 extension staff and agricultural officers trained in IPM and FFS and IPM/FFS workshop with participation of	MS 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]
	participating farmers and baseline yield	inception phase -No pesticide container management plan in place		20% improvement in citrus yields among participating farmers Empty pesticide container management scheme piloted in 1 region (Zoba Makael) by the end of the project	47 persons was conducted in June 2014 25 extension workers trained in IPM and FFS by international expert followed by a refresher course in 2017. At least 4 local FFS including IPM activities was conducted between November 2015 until June 2018 – participation of at least 112 farmers. 120 contaminated metal drums and stored them safely at Daeropoulos pesticide store. Disposal of plastic containers not undertaken as local coke facility earmarked for the activity had challenges including electricity.	MS 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]
Outcome 3: Raised awareness of pesticide hazards and risk reduction	Communication strategy implemented - level of awareness of pesticide hazards and risk reduction among target groups raised (as assessed by the KAP survey)	One Knowledge Attitudes and Practice (KAP) survey will be completed in the first quarter of implementation to update awareness information from a 2007 KAP survey		Communication strategy implemented 20% increase in awareness at the end of the project	KAP survey completed and used as basis for communication strategy Comprehensive communication strategy elaborated Tender for rolling out communication strategy awarded; and communication products produced	S
Outcome 4: Project monitored and evaluated effectively	M&E activities implemented as scheduled in the M&E plan, and associated quality M&E reports prepared (quality/effectiveness of M&E and reports as assessed in mid-term review and terminal evaluation)	M&E plan not implemented		All monitoring and evaluation activities completed as scheduled in the M&E plan All M&E reports prepared and available throughout project implementation	All monitoring activities completed. Six months PPR and annual PIRs completed Regular SC meetings held	S

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

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1 Target i)Risk reduction strategy developed and demonstrated for sites with heavily contaminated soil and building materials (1500m3 contaminated soils)	Since project closed without a detailed analysis of the contaminated soils, the Government should mobilize resources for the analysis to inform disposal pathway /remediation protocol.	Government of Eritrea FAO to share landfill feasibility study with PSC FAO can suggest possible development partners that the Government can approach	September 2019
Outcome 1 targets: ii)Recycling/ local disposal strategy developed and demonstrated for 53 000 contaminated empty containers **iii)Recycling/disposal strategy developed and demonstrated for 5 400 contaminated sprayers**	Government to continue exploration of other local facilities for local disposal e.g. with the Ghedem Cement Factory and but as it was not implemented on time the project NTE has passed.		

[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]						7th and final PIR	Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[14] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th PIR	6th PIR			
Output 1.1 8 stores upgraded as intermediate collection centres and 1 central collection centre constructed	Q4Y5	One store at Daeropaulos upgraded.	Stores at Daeropaolos and Keren upgraded. The upgrading of the remaining stores is planned. The Terms of Reference for a local design engineer to design the central collection centre (store) have been prepared. Local approvals for initiating the process are pending.	Stores at Daeropaolos and Keren upgraded Invitation to Bid publicized in local newspapers Jul 2015 for design of central collection store.	Stores at Daeropaolos and Keren upgraded. Contract signed in March 2016 for design of central collection store.	Central Store will not be built as site allocated previously is given for other purpose by government	Central store will not built the budget is shifted to other activity	Central store not built; resources reallocated in agreement with PSC.	50%	Central collection store could not be built as site allocated in 2016 has been used for a different purpose. At the 11th SC Meeting, on Oct. 13, 2016, it was clarified by LTO, if site is allocated later than Dec 31, 2016, there will not be ample time to design and construct

[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.

										it. MoA could not identify a site by the given date. So, the central store activity has been unsuccessful and could not be pursued
Output 1.2 400 tonnes of POPs and other obsolete pesticides destructed in an environmentally sound manner	Q3 Y5	Nothing destroyed.	Offers for the disposal operations have been received	Contract signed with Veolia Field Services (Nov 14); Basel Notification for export (Jun 2015).	Contract signed with Veolia Field Services (Nov 14); Basel Notification for export (Jun 2015). 92 tonnes shipped September 2015 and 68 tonnes April 2016.	Contract signed with Veolia Field Services (Nov 14); Basel Notification for export (Jun 2015). 95.57 tons was shipped on February 2017 and last was 107 tons shipped on May 2017.	Last shipment of 107 done in August 2017	Total of 364 tonnes obsolete pesticide wastes shipped out to the UK for high temperature incineration. Local disposal of 70t of actelic storage insecticides not completed for lack of suitable local facility.	90%	
Output 1.3 Recycling/disposal strategy developed and	Q4 Y5	Nothing was done.	Successful trials on washing empty contaminated plastic containers	Successful trials on washing empty	Successful trials on washing empty	Successful trials on washing empty	The national safeguarding team have successfully	720 empty drums processed and	70%	SC agreed that local disposal of plastic containers and

demonstrated for 53 000 contaminated empty containers			has taken place. Discussions with local recycling company is ongoing.	contaminated plastic containers have taken place. Discussions with local recycling company is ongoing Strategy approved by MoLWE.	contamina ted plastic containers have taken place. Discussions with local recycling company is ongoing Strategy approved by MoLWE.	contamina ted plastic containers have taken place. Discussions with local recycling company is ongoing Strategy approved by MoLWE.	cut and cleaned about 120 contaminate d metal drums stored them safely at Daeropoulo s pesticide store	cleaned by the locally trained team at time of project closure. Cleaned drums safely stored ar Daeropoul os pesticide store.		old knapsack sprayers would be done at
Output 1.4 Risk reduction strategy developed and implemented for sites with heavily contaminated soils and building materials	Q4 Y5	No PIR completed.	Soil samples have been collected from 4 contaminated sites and a proposal for further actions been prepared	Strategy for Massawa site presented and approved by local authority. Public meeting held (40 attendees) National strategy being prioritized by MoLWE.	Strategy for Massawa site presen ted and approved by local authority. Public meeting held (40 attendees) National strategy being prioritized by MoLWE	Landfill site has been allocated by NRS administrati on. Moving towards implementa tion of concept on the landfill.	AGPMC as LTU have drafted a Letter of Agreement (LoA) with Green Cross Switzerland for the feasibility study for the landfill The LoA will inform the best way forward with the landfill	Under an LoA with FAO, Green Cross Switzerland successfully completed the landfill feasibility study and made recommen dations to the project. Recommen dations included indepth characteriz ation of contamina nt types and levels to inform	45%	Project closed before characterizatio n of soil contamination

								disposal or in situ bioremediation of contaminated soils.		
Output 2.1 New pesticides legislation finalized and approved	Q4 Y5	Law drafted and under review/adoption by Ministry of Justice	Law drafted and approved by Ministry of Justice. To be presented in the National Assembly in September.	Being considered by National Assembly.	Submitted and under consideration by National Assembly.	Awaiting enactment.	Both the Tigrigna and Arabic version are edited and workshop will be conducted for its validation	Workshop conducted to validate the draft pesticide legislation documents translated into vernacular	90%	Approval of the legislation lies with Government. At time of project closure documents had been submitted to Government.
Output 2.2 Capacity built to implement new legislation	Q4 Y5	Nothing was completed.	Awaiting enactment of legislation	Awaiting enactment of legislation	Awaiting enactment of legislation	Awaiting enactment of legislation	Awaiting Enactment of legislation.		0%	At time of project closure, Government had not assented the new legislation.
Output 2.3 Biological control for key citrus pests established	Q4 Y5	MOA has yet to determine that Citrus is the priority crop for the IPM component	The import of Cales Noacki has been agreed and the process for importing the insect is ongoing	October 2013 study into citrus pesticide use and crop losses The import of Cales Noacki for Wooly Whitefly and Citrus Leaf Miner in progress; best method of release being revised by	IPM focus change to tomato rather than citrus following the ministerial study tour by the Minister and heads of departments to Jordan in October	Pest survey for citrus is being conducted and will have results end of August.	Pest survey for citrus is conducted and the collection of pest specimen is done and underway to send abroad for analysis and identification.	Samples identified and results shared with Department of Regulatory Services	60%	

				experts from Jordan and Israel	2014 to Jordan.					
Output 2.4 IPM approaches for citrus developed and adopted by at least 100 farmers	Q4 Y5	MOA has yet to determine that Citrus is the priority crop for the IPM component Study underway	The import of Cales Noacki has been agreed and the process for importing the insect is ongoing. It may be difficult to reach 100 farmers	FFS/IPM expert was hired on 26.6.2015 for tomato IPM/FFS Due to the season long training it may be difficult to reach 100 farmers who have adopted the approach)	Tomato IPM/FFS training was conducted from August till December 2016 where 25 extension workers was trained. Plans are being made to provide support to Regions such that the FFS can be initiated at regional level. The target to reach 100 farmers who have adopted the approach might be overambitious.	Assistance will be given to 5 regions to conduct 5 baby FFS.	Two Zobas are actively working on the planned FFS program and other three Zobas are making plan for the coming season.	Four Zobas actively working on IPM FFS at the time of project closure	80%	Government widely accepted IPM FFS and also adopted in other pest management programmes including Fall Armyworm
Output 2.5 2.05 Opportunities and next steps for IPM in priority crop(s) other than citrus identified	Q3 Y5	Study underway	Workshop on FFS/IPM identified tomato as other priority crop to address by IPM – a plan for providing IPM assistance is being developed	FFS/IPM expert will assist in process during missions to Eritrea	The project has identified tomato and key horticultural crops as priority for IPM.	Citrus has been identified as the target crop and survey is underway.	Survey on Citrus conducted and citrus pest specimen collected and underway to be send abroad for		90%	

							analysis and identificatio n			
Output 2.6 FAO's Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS) operationalised in Eritrea	Q1 Y2	IT set-up for PSMS in Eritrea has been agreed with MOA and Computer for operating the PSMS have been ordered	PSMS computer have been installed at the RSD-MoA. There need to be a formal training in the use of the system. Discussions on providing such training is initiated	Cancelled Refer PIR 2014	Cancelled Refer PIR 2014	Cancelled Refer PIR 2014	Cancelled Refer PIR 2014		0%	Cancelled Refer PIR 2014
Output 2.7 Regulatory staff from MoA and MoLWE trained in pesticide risk management and regulation	Q2 Y5	Two staff have been accepted onto the University of Cape Town Diploma course on pesticide risk management	Unfortunately, one of the two has withdrawn from the course. A formal way of disseminating the information from the course to other ministerial staff is being planned.	One staff has graduated from the Masters course at UCT Staff training awaiting passage of legislation	One staff has graduated from the Masters course at UCT. Staff training awaiting passage of legislation	Training to 62 staff from MoA and MoLWE was given on pesticide stock managemen t and pesticide store managemen t.	RSD & MoLWE receive 1 weeks' technical support/ on-the-job training to strengthen regulatory procedures on the remaining duration		90%	
Output 2.8 MoA staff trained in stock management, needs assessment and procurement of pesticides, stock management and equipped to provide necessary training to storekeepers	Q2 Y5	Not Achieved at this stage.	Dedicated computer server for running FAO's Pesticide Stock Management System had to be established at MoA	Dedicated computer server for running FAO's Pesticide Stock Management System had to be established at MoA ToR for training	LTO to propose potential consultants for undertaking training.	Training to 62 staff from MoA and MoLWE was given on pesticide stock managemen t and pesticide store	1 booklet developed, printed and distributed to all pesticide storekeeper on the remaining duration	No training foreseen during period under review.	75%	

				consultant under preparation (Jul 15)		management.				
Output 2.9 Empty container recycling scheme piloted in Zoba Maekel	Q4 Y5	Not achieved at this stage	In the process depending on the outcome of the recycling trials	Please refer to output 1.3	Please refer to output 1.3	Please refer to output 1.3	Please refer to output 1.3	Please refer to output 1.3		Please refer to output 1.3
Output 2.10 Plan to upgrade pest laboratory at RSD de implemented	Q1 Y3	Specifications prepared	Specifications prepared. It is questionable whether the laboratory will be able to sustain the operation of the instrument. In case fund are lacking for other activities it could be provided from this activity	Cancelled (PIR 2014)	Cancelled (PIR 2014)	Cancelled (PIR 2014)	Cancelled (PIR 2014)	Cancelled (PIR 2014)	0%	
Output 3.1 Communications strategy updated and awareness campaign on pesticide hazards and risk reduction implemented.	Q4 Y5	To be Initiated in December 2013 and implemented throughout the project duration	Workshop have been conducted and a revised strategy developed Tender for providing a audio visual campaign has been issued by June 2014.	One bid for the tender was received and scope and input with the PR company agreed. Contract foreseen in August 15	Bids received for communication campaign. Discussions concerning the information campaign have prevented signing of a contract with the selected local company. It is expected that the new FAO representative	Communications Company engaged. Production to be completed by Sept. 30, 2017. Campaign to commence and continue after that.	Training materials and video products prepared and underway for distribution and broadcasting	Prining of more awareness raising materials continues during review period, including the IPM FFS training manual.	90%	

					will be able to facilitate the initiation of the activity					
Output 3.2 IPM promoted to policy- makers	Q4 Y5	Study tour for senior agricultural staff in Philippines in 2011 However further study tour for policy makers to Jordan necessary to gain high-level support for mainstreaming IPM within MOA	Participation of policy makers in FFS/IPM workshop Study tour for senior agricultural staff in Philippines in 2011 A study tour for policy makers to Jordan has been planned aiming at gaining high-level support for mainstreaming IPM within MOA	A study tour for policy makers to Jordan in October 2014 Participation of policy makers in FFS/IPM workshop Study tour for senior agricultural staff in Philippines in 2011 Workshop planned when FFS/IPM activity for tomato is finalized	A study tour for policy makers to Jordan in October 2014. Participation of policy makers in FFS/IPM workshop Study tour for senior agricultural staff in Philippines in 2011. Workshop planned when FFS/IPM activity for tomato is finalized.	A study tour for policy makers to Jordan in October 2014. Participation of policy makers in FFS/IPM workshop Study tour for senior agricultural staff in Philippines in 2011. Workshop planned when FFS/IPM activity for tomato is	At least three visits made at the end of the project	IPM FFS manual developed and can be a resource for policy makers.	90%	

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:

- Under a Letter of Agreement with FAO, Green Cross Switzerland completed a feasibility study for the landfill for disposal of hazardous wastes, including contaminated soils. The report recommended characterization of contaminant type and level to inform in situ bioremediation of the contaminated soils at Massawa.
- IPM FFS international consultants were recruited and IPM FFS training manual developed and sent for designing and printing.
- Validation workshops were conducted to finalize and validate the draft pesticide legislation documents.
- The terminal evaluation was completed.

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?
Max 200 words:

The most topical and outstanding activity during the review period was disposal/remediation of the contaminated soils at Massawa. While the PSC and Government had envisaged construction of a landfill for disposal of the soils and the obsolete storage insecticides (70t of Actellic dusts), consensus was reached with FAO to commission a feasibility study to clarify options and way forward. The Green Cross report on the landfill feasibility recommended sampling the contaminated soils to characterize type and contaminant level to inform in situ bioremediation as a stop gap measure to reduce risks from the contaminated soils. Even with an exceptional no cost extension to 30 June 2019, the project did not make progress in recruitment of a remediation consultant.

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating[15]	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating[16]	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	**MS**	**MS**	Other project outputs have been achieved well. The IPM FFS manual was completed and was under pronting at time of report preparation. However, other than the complete landfill feasibility study, the project fell short of implementing the recommended risk characterization and bioremediation of the contaminated soils.
Budget Holder	**MS**	**MS**	Key achievements in all the components have been have been realized so far. However, a major challenge remains with the local capacity especially the landfill that was planned to be used for the local disposal of contaminated soil and some obsolete stocks, as well as coke facility for the small plastic containers. The budget and time remaining was insufficient for the design and construction of landfill. It is anticipated that the Government will be able to use the landfill feasibility recommendations for resource mobilization to continue with the work beyond the project lifespan.
Lead Technical Officer[17]	**MS**	**MS**	While execution of other activities foreseen under the review period was satisfactory, the lack of progress with the bioremediation of the contaminated soils warrants an overall MS rating. It is important to note that there was insufficient enough budget and time to complete the landfill design and construction. Due to lack of readily available experts, the risk characterization and bioremediation did not materialize.
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	**MS**	**MS**	While most some key results have been achieved, especially disposal results, sustainability of the capacity built is not convincing – e.g. lengthy delay in getting the new pesticide legislation through approval.

[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	Environmental and Social Risk classification still valid.

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

	Risk	Risk rating[19]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[20]	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Larger than expected volumes of waste are found at burial locations or additional sites are identified	Low	The final inventory showed a slightly smaller quantity of OP safeguarded to be disposed via the international contractor.	Inventory completed and targets met for the volume of obsolete stocks for overseas disposal.	A complimentary GEF project should developed from the GEF allocation 7

[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
2	Landfill design and construction not completed due to time and budget constraints.	H	Agreement with SC is for the project to go as far as is possible with existing resources and timelines. Feasibility study to provide further insight.	Landfill feasibility study recommended in-situ bioremediation in the short term and long-term investment in a landfill for hazardous waste disposal.	Government should mobilize resources to complete pending disposal activities.

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
Low	Medium	Instead of design and construction of the landfill, a feasibility study was undertaken in agreement with the PSC in view of the available budget and remaining project implementation time. The study recommended interim in situ treatment of contaminated soils (bioremediation) and long-term solution for sound disposal (in a landfill) for the contaminated soils and storage insecticide dusts. However, the interim in situ treatment of contaminated soils did not materialize due to delays in recruiting a remediation expect. The overall risk rating to medium is based on the project's failure to deliver on risk reduction of the contaminated soils.

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months[21]

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

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

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

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	Original NTE: Dec.31, 2018 Revised NTE: June 30, 2019 Justification: The project was extended to June 30, 2019 to allow for the completion of all key remaining activities especially landfill issue.

[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 design was not specific in gender mainstreaming, the project has as far as possible taken a gender sensitive approach including ensuring gender balance in all activities – technical training, IPM FFS as well as in reporting.

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

If applies, 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. None specifically documented.

7. Stakeholders Engagement

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

List of stakeholders and their roles

- ✓ policy-makers at several ministries (e.g. Agriculture, Environment, Health, Education, Justice) with regard to improved pesticide use and management, and policy development towards sustainable agriculture, sustainable hazardous waste management and chemical manufacturing;
- ✓ national staff involved in safeguarding, disposal and prevention activities. A cadre of 14 staff drawn from MoA and MoLWE was trained and successfully completed all the safeguarding activities in Eritrea. The same team was also responsible for volume reduction and cleaning of contaminated metal drums.
- ✓ national authorities who will be able to use the capacity developed for project implementation for improved management of hazardous waste;
- ✓ national authorities involved in the control of pesticide imports and quality control of pesticides e.g. from Regulatory Services Department (RSD) and MoLWE
- ✓ national agricultural services and research institutions will benefit from strengthened policy and strategy environments with respect to the sustainable management of pests e.g Department of Extension Services; Hamalmalo Agricultural College.
- ✓ advisory / extension services and contact farmers will benefit from training in integrated pest management
- ✓ Farmers, citrus and vegetable farmers in particular, will be empowered to adopt and adapt IPM approaches in order to improve pest management whilst tackling the over-use of pesticides and associated negative impacts on human health, the environment and farm income.
- ✓ A variety of groups will benefit from communications materials on pesticide safety. It is anticipated that the Ministry of Education will continue distributing communications materials to its adult education service, including adult education / community centres throughout the target area. Other important groups that could benefit from communications include women's associations, 'Green Clubs' school environmental clubs, Summer camps run for students during the rainy season and youth associations.
- ✓ Farmers and other users of pesticides will benefit from increased awareness of the hazards posed by pesticides
- ✓ Women and men of rural communities will benefit from a less hazardous and polluted environment The indirect beneficiaries can be summarized as:
    - Women and men consumers who will become increasingly aware of the threat posed by overuse of pesticides in food production and risks to exposure reduced by the various interventions;
    - Women and men farmers whose exposure to illegal, and sub-standard pesticides will be reduced
    - The global population and environment in the case of releases of POPs pesticides.

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

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

- *The safeguarding and disposal of obsolete pesticides; main focus of GCP/ERI/017/JPN was a huge success. Over 60 stores were safeguarded and obsolete pesticides repacked for a total of almost 364 tons (out of the target of 400) shipped to the U.K. for high temperature incineration thereby eliminating significant risks to human health and the environment.*
- *The stores at Daeropoulos and Dekemhare were in critical state. At Daeropoulos the locally trained team safeguarded leaking plastic containers. The store in Dekemhare was a critical site where leaking pesticides were located in a store in the same building complex as living quarters. Families were very grateful for the project intervention to safeguard, ship away the stocks and stabilize the site. Because of the project, the living quarters have been made safe and quality of life has significantly improved for the residents.*
- *The disposal operations were conducted by a team of trained staff from MoA and MoLWE under FAO supervision. The old pesticides were transferred to new drums and the floor cleaned. The repacked materials were transported to the central store at Daeropoulos with most of them eventually shipped for high temperature incineration. The project boasts of unique national capacity building for hazardous waste management.*
- *IPM FFS manual and other information, edication and communication materials developed to promote sound life cycle management of pesticides and sustainable pest management.*

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
Japanese project	Government of Japan	Grant	1,494,153	1,485,468	1,494,153	1,494,153
Bilateral Donor	European Commission	Grant	100,000	100,000		100,000
Government of Eritrea	Government of Eritrea	In kind	250,000	140,000	250,000	250,000
CropLife International	Private Sector	In kind	380,000	90,000	380,000	380,000
FAO	GEF Agency	Grant	935,000	620,000		935,000
FAO	GEF Agency	In kind	50,000	30,000	50,000	50,000
		TOTAL	3,209,153	2,465,468		3,209,153

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 Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

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

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