



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

Project Type: Full-sized Project

Type of Trust Fund: GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Pesticide Risk Reduction in Malawi			
Country	Malawi	GEF Project ID	5109
GEF Agency	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	616334
Other Executing Partner(s)	Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development	Submission Date:	August 26, 2014
GEF Focal Area(s):	Chemicals – POPs	Project Duration (Months)	36 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Agency Fee (\$):	255,000

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CHEM-1	Outcome 1.4 POPs waste prevented, managed and disposed of, and POPs contaminated sites managed in an environmentally sound manner.	Output 1.4.1 Strategies for the disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides, and for the remediation of contaminated sites developed and implemented.	GEFTF	2,550,000	11,879,374
Total Project Costs				2,550,000	11,879,374

B. Project Framework

Project Objective: To reduce economic, environmental and social risks associated with the use of pesticides in agriculture and to promote sustainable intensification of agriculture						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
Component 1: Safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of heavily contaminated sites	TA	<p><u>Outcome 1:</u> Risks to human health and the environment are reduced through safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of pesticide-contaminated sites.</p> <p><i>Main indicators:</i></p> <p>a) 240 tonnes of POPs and other obsolete pesticides disposed by high temperature incineration</p> <p>b) 150 tonnes of degraded</p>	<p>1.1 A safeguarding and disposal strategy is developed in line with national and international best practice</p> <p>1.2 240 tonnes of obsolete stocks and associated hazardous waste are disposed of in an environmentally</p>	GEFTF	1,341,700	2,819,000

		<p><i>pesticide disposed locally by Government</i></p> <p>c) <i>At least one contaminated site with reduced risk of exposure/contamination level (50% reduction).</i></p>	<p>sound manner</p> <p>1.3 Risks posed by one contaminated site reduced</p>			
<p>Component 2: Management of empty containers</p>	TA	<p><u>Outcome 2</u> Health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their reuse are reduced</p> <p><u>Main indicators:</u> a) <i>Number of empty containers triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling; 90% of all containers collected collected/stored/recycled (Target: 10,000 in PY1 and 2 ; 45,000 in PY3.)</i></p>	<p>2.1 Container management pilot implemented in southern regions of Malawi</p> <p>2.2 Assessment and scaling up of the Blantyre pilot scheme to a permanent operator completed</p>	GEFTF	284,000	360,000
<p>Component 3: Strengthening legal and institutional framework for pesticide risk management and life cycle management</p>	TA	<p><u>Outcome 3</u> Legal and institutional frameworks strengthened for sound life cycle management</p> <p><u>Main indicators:</u> a) <i>Revised national legislation and regulations in compliance with international and regional obligations adopted by PY2</i> b) <i>Endorsement of the National Strategy &/or Action Plan (NSAP) specifically pertaining to implementation of the Code</i> c) <i>An information exchange platform hosted by PCB to strengthen intergovernmental coordination and cooperation on hazardous chemical management validated and operational.</i></p>	<p>3.1 National regulations developed and updated in conformity to international guidelines and submitted to Government for approval</p> <p>3.2 Measures to strengthen the capacity of the Pesticide Control Board to enforce post-registration regulations developed</p> <p>3.3 National capacity for pesticide inspections and post-registration enforcement strengthened (<i>at least 20 plant protection, inspectors, customs and other concerned staff trained (M/F); National network of pesticide information exchange operational</i>)</p>	GEFTF	167,500	940,000
<p>Component 4: Promotion of alternatives to POPs and other hazardous chemical pesticides</p>	TA	<p><u>Outcome 4</u> IPM alternatives to conventional pesticides successfully promoted and the use of chemical pesticides and highly hazardous pesticides reduced through Farmer Field Schools.</p> <p><u>Main indicators:</u> a) <i>800 farmers trained on</i></p>	<p>4.1 IPM FFS implementation strategy validated with key stakeholders</p> <p>4.2 30 IPM FFS on cotton, and vegetables established in 3 ADDs (Salima, Shire Valley</p>	GEFTF	422,500	7,160,374

		<i>Integrated Pest Management (IPM) through Farmer Field Schools (FFS)</i> b) % Reduction in pesticide use on cotton, vegetables, maize among trained farmers	and Machinga) 4.3 Communication and dissemination strategy to raise awareness on pesticide risks along the pesticide life cycle and to promote IPM implemented.			
Component 5: Monitoring and Evaluation	TA	Outcome 5.1: Project monitored and evaluated effectively and best practices disseminated.	5.1 A monitoring and evaluation plan inclusive of an impact assessment implemented. 5.2 Midterm and final evaluations carried out 5.3 Project “best-practices” and “lessons-learned” disseminated via publications, and other means to be identified in the communication strategy..	GEFTF	190,000	300,000
Subtotal					2,405,700	11,579,374
Project management Cost (PMC)					144,300	300,000
Total project costs					2,550,000	11,879,374

C. Sources of Confirmed Co-financing for the Project by Source and by Name (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI)	In-kind	380,000
Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (MoAI)	Grant	2,243,000
Government	Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation (Pesticides Control Board)	In-kind	1,113,854
Government	Ministry of Trade and Industry- Malawi Bureau of Standards (MBS)	In-Kind	350,000
Government	Ministry of Environment and Climate Change Management (MoECCM) – Environmental Affairs Department (EAD)	In Kind	360,000
Private Sector	Croplife International	Grant	1,250,000
Private Sector	Croplife International	In-kind	50,000
Civil society	SelfHelp Africa	Grant	1,158,359
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	4,574,161
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	400,000
Total Co-financing			11,879,374

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency, Focal Area and Country

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total C=A+B
FAO	GEFTF	POPs	Malawi	2,550,000	255,000	2,013,000
Total Grant Resources				2,550,000	250,000	2,013,000

F. Consultants Working for Technical Assistance Components:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants ⁴	510,000	500,000	1,100,000
National/Local Consultants	150,000	300,000	450,000

G. Does the Project Include a “Non-Grant” Instrument? NO

Part II: Project Justification

A. Describe any changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF⁵

The following changes have been made:

Total project components. The original PIF had 3 technical components namely, 1. Safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides, and remediation of contaminated soils; 2. Strengthening life cycle management (including management of pesticide empty containers) and 3. Promoting alternatives to chemical pesticides). In the full project document, component 2 has been split into 2 components to single out the issue of container management from the other post-registration aspects. The full size project therefore has 4 technical components.

Component 1. Safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of heavily contaminated sites. In both the original PIF and the project document, component 1 has the two broad objectives to safely dispose POPs and other obsolete pesticides and to remediate contaminated sites. Since the PIF preparation some key actions with respect to centralisation and safeguarding of pesticides have taken place. Moreover, the PPG had generated some additional, more recent data on the status of the obsolete stocks. Therefore, the structure of component 1 presented in the PIF has been rationalised and reorganised. As a result, in the full project document component 1 presents the following three outputs: 1.1 Safeguarding disposal strategy developed; 1.2 240 tonnes of obsolete stocks are disposed of in an environmentally sound manner; 1.3 Risks posed by one contaminated site are significantly reduced. The budget for component 1 has been increased by about 300,000 USD to match the latest estimated cost per unit of pesticide disposal of 4,500 USD/tonnes. The difference was drawn from the budget originally allotted to pesticide legislation and regulation in the PIF as significant progress in this area has been made under a co-financing FAO supported project.

Component 2. Management of empty containers. Empty container management in the PIF was an output under Component 2 - Strengthening life cycle management. In the full project document, the design and implementation of an empty container management system is presented as a separate component with two outputs, namely 2.1 –Container management pilot implemented in southern regions of Malawi and 2.2-Assessment and scaling up of the Blantyre pilot scheme to a permanent operator completed. The budget required to support this component is estimated at USD 284,000.

⁴ International consultants include regional consultants.

⁵ For questions A.1 – A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since the PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet of the PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

Component 3. Strengthening legal and institutional frameworks for pesticide risk management and life cycle management. In line with the recommendations from stakeholders formulated at the Inception and Validation Workshops, this component has been renamed from “strengthening life cycle management” to ‘Strengthening legal and institutional frameworks for pesticide risk management and life cycle management.’ In order to achieve explicitness and clarity in the project activities, outputs for this component have been unbundled and redefined. Accordingly, the full project presents three outputs for this component: 3.1 – National Regulations developed and submitted to Government for approval; 3.2 – Measures to strengthen the capacity of PCB to enforce post registration regulations developed; 3.3 – National capacity for pesticide inspections and post registration enforcement strengthened. The budget allotted for this component is USD 167,500.

Component 4. Component 4 on promotion of alternatives through the Farmer Field School approach reflects the structure in the PIF with a more articulated definition of the activities elaborated as part of the PPG. In the PIF, three focus crops had been indentified namely cotton, maize and vegetables. A national programme is already addressing the issue of post-harvest in maize and therefore it is proposed that the GEF project will mostly focus on vegetables and cotton.

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessment under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e., NAPAs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

N/A

A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities

The project contributes to the implementation of the GEF-5 Chemicals Strategy. It focuses on: CHEM-1, specifically the management, prevention and disposal of POPs wastes and sound environmental management of contaminated sites. The project will dispose of about 240 tonnes of existing obsolete pesticides and remediate one heavily contaminated priority site. To prevent future mismanagement, focus will also be on strengthening institutional capacity to improve and enforce pesticide regulations.

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage

N/A

A.4 The baseline project and the problem it seeks to address

Following the PPG data collection and analyses, the description of the problem and the baseline has been improved. Please see section 1.2 in the FAO project document.

A.5 Incremental/Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project

The incremental reasoning has been refined based on PPG analyses. Please see section 1.2 b and c in the FAO project document.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks

General project risks		
Risk	Ranking	Mitigation measures
Insufficient funds dedicated to the the remediation od prioritized site and the disposal	Medium	Budget estimates are based on rates for ongoing disposal activities. If there is a need for additional co-financing, it will be availed from project partners and related projects during project implementation.

of POPs.		
Institutional arrangements pose challenges to project execution.	Low	Consultation meetings with stakeholders were held and implementation arrangements agreed during the preparation of the project. Institutional arrangements, including the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders will be confirmed again at the start of project implementation.
Increased pilferage of centralized stocks before repackaging and transportation for final disposal	Medium	Consultation meetings held with SFFRFM to increase security at premises. Site securing and adequate training of staff at SFFRFM.
Likelihood of political instability .	Low	Although there are currently no signs of unrest which could affect the project, this will be closely monitored during project implementation.
Extreme weather conditions such as torrential rain and floods	Low to medium	The Central stores holding the obsolete stocks are far from flood prone areas.
Component specific risks		
Component 1		
Environmental contamination from leakage of POPs and other obsolete pesticides due to poor conditions of containers	High	Management measures to be included in the EMP include field procedures to ensure no further leakage occurs during the project activities.
Continued government centralised procurement of pesticides through parastatal companies will give rise to re-accumulation of obsolete stocks	High	As part of component 3, government stakeholders will be engaged to develop pesticide policies that are more responsive to user demands and avoid large-scale procurements. Under Component 4 there will be communication strategies aimed at policy makers.
Lack of appropriate storage for safeguarded stocks	Low	Central stores conforming to FAO EA guidelines already identified and currently holding CLI safeguarded stocks in Lilongwe and Blantyre
Local treatment of Skana Dusts not successful or are incomplete leading to leakage and runoff	Low	Recommendation for bioremediation to be based on product test results. Treatment according to researched method; use runoff and leachate control system
Incidents during safeguarding	High	All staff / enterprise of the project engaged in safeguarding operations have been trained; and training will be refreshed in PY1. All workers will be provided with protection gear by the international contractor. Strict application of measures included in Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and Health and Safety Plans.
Delays in the procurement of equipment necessary for the disposal	Low	Equipment to be supplied as part of international contract. Contractor to provide all necessary documents to GoM to allow timely import.
Government authorities disagree with the strategy for the reduction of risks posed by contaminated sites	Medium	Strategy will be developed based on objective data and options presented to government for endorsement. EAD has been involved in disposal and remediation plans from the beginning.
Delays in administrative procedures / decisions as regards transport of obsolete stocks	Medium	Administrative procedures have slowed down clearances process during the TCP implementation. Guidance of the competent Government authority as regards to procedures of the Basel Convention has been provided. Protocols followed during transportation of methyl bromide cylinders prior to disposal during the TCP will be followed.
Component 2		
Technical staff being exposed to pesticides during collection and repacking of empty containers	Low to medium	Training modules on collection techniques for the safe collection, repackaging and storage of wastes will be executed, and Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) provided for all personnel involved in container collection.
Lack of stakeholder involvement in proper disposal of empty containers and in the establishment of a sustainable system for the management of wastes.	Low	An awareness campaign and communication strategy will be put in place on safe disposal of empty containers
Component 3		
Delayed adoption of updated legislation. Law making (including promulgation of regulations) is a prerogative of the State and will depend on	Medium	Continued sensitization will be conducted during project execution including national training sessions and stakeholder meetings including awareness raising targeting policy makers.

the will of the legislature or law-making authority to enact legislation		
Component 4		
Loss of IPM FFS facilitators after investment on ToT	Medium	Project to enter into firms agreements with facilitators institutions of origin (DAES and DCD); Adopt the lead farmer strategy where farmers are trained to be facilitators
Climate Change Changes in the climate will impact on pest distribution, activity, seasonal appearance, as well as impact on the behaviour of chemicals in the environment.	Medium	The project has forged a link with NGOs such as Self Help Africa promoting organic farming and FFS; is being cofinanced by FAO projects promoting resilience and CSA and is building onto existing community based initiatives in close collaboration with DAES. These links will allow the project to learn directly from farmers about the specific climate impacts on production, and the project will document and encourage sharing of knowledge on climate resilient forms of pest control.

A.7 Coordination with other GEF financed initiatives

The project will be closely coordinated with similar GEF-financed initiatives in Benin, Cameroon and Morocco, mainly through the FAO Lead Technical Unit (the Pesticide Risk Reduction Group in the Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) who will be providing technical oversight and guidance to all these projects.

B. Additional information not addressed at the PIF stage

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

A multi-stakeholder project steering committee (PSC) will be established to provide high level consultation and oversight to overall project implementation. The PSC will bring together key institutions including the Government Ministries (Department of Agricultural Extension Services (DAES) DCD (Department of Crop Development (DCD), Department of Agricultural Research Services (DARS) , Environmental Affairs Department (EAD), Malawi Bureau of Standards (MBS), industry (CropLife Malawi and Great Lakes Cotton Company (GLCC), academia (Bunda College of Agriculture), farmer associations (FUM) and key non-government organizations (NGOs) working on alternatives to pesticides and related activities such as SelfHelpAfrica (SHA). During project preparation, consultations were held with other development agencies with related projects in Malawi. These agencies will be invited to participate in the stakeholder workshops to ensure coordination of the project with key related initiatives.

The Project Steering Committee will be the policy setting body with regard to all issues affecting the achievement of the project's objectives. The PSC will be responsible for providing general oversight of the project's implementation and will ensure that all activities agreed upon under the GEF project document, are adequately prepared and carried out.

The project will be implemented through collaboration with partners who will contribute to the execution of specific components/outputs. During project preparation the partners were identified for their institutional mandates and technical expertise. Involvement of these partners will enhance stakeholder participation, ensure optimal utilization of networks and skills already built as well as fostering sustainability of results post project.

At local community/farmer level the project will work with NGOs such as Self Help Africa, private sector - the Great Lakes Cotton company; Farmers' Organizations – Farmers Union of Malawi as well other projects promoting sustainable agriculture (Climate Smart Agriculture; Food Security programmes, Conservation Agriculture and Child Labour Programme) who will raise awareness of their stakeholders and participants about project activities and contribute towards the execution of component 4 on promoting safer alternatives and raising awareness on pesticide risks.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)

The project will generate community health benefits through decreased exposure to highly hazardous pesticides, by a) removing sources of these chemicals from stockpiles and contaminated sites, b) removing contaminated containers from communities, c) promoting and encouraging availability and uptake of non-toxic alternatives, d) enhancing the quality of products through better control of pesticides in their life cycle, ultimately reducing pesticide residues e) better health monitoring and reduced risks as a result of heightened awareness f) long term investment into pesticide risk reduction at national level as a result of better understanding from grassroots through to policy level and g) increased economic returns as a result of reduced production costs.

Children by virtue of their body weight and high activity; especially those in agricultural labour are more vulnerable to pesticide poisoning. Due to the traditional roles and responsibilities, women are more vulnerable to the adverse effects of pesticide exposure than men. Literacy levels among women in Malawi are significantly lower and this makes them more vulnerable to pesticide poisoning as their ability to read and understand instruction on pesticide labels is limited. Women also constitute the bulk of the agricultural labor force and are exposed to high pesticide residues in handling produce. Women may also produce food for family consumption but use pesticides intended for other crops, not in accordance with the intended uses and conditions, exposing themselves and their families to high levels of inappropriate residues. Project activities will take the gender dimensions into account, through consulting women, identifying specific needs and concerns, especially through the Farmer Field School approach. The project will ensure that: women are represented in project component activities, thus increasing opportunities for professional women in the agriculture sector; and specifically target women through partnerships with civil society organizations in training and awareness-raising activities, to ensure women are aware of the risks posed by pesticides, and empty pesticide containers, which are widely used for a variety of domestic purposes throughout Malawi especially for storage of food and water. The FFS curriculum apart from covering crop production and protection issues will also be designed to engage participants (men, women, youths) in topical socioeconomic issues including market access, HIV AIDS, Gender Based Violence (GBV) and other key life skills.

B.3 Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design

Cost effectiveness will be achieved through: (i) building on existing capacity developed under previous and on-going initiatives implemented by FAO and other partners; (ii) exploring the opportunity to include the disposal of all obsolete stocks under the regional disposal contract for other Southern Africa countries to reduce transaction costs and the actual cost of disposal; (iii) employment of local or regional expertise when available and (iv) south to south cooperation in promotion of alternatives.

For component 2, in designing the container management scheme, it has been proposed to build on the rudimentary infrastructure for recycling plastic containers from the CleanFarms project. For Component 4 the FFS will be set up in Agricultural Development Divisions (ADD) where previous FAO work has already established Farmer Study Groups for promotion of IPM using the FFS approach. It was established during the PG phase that the farmers and extension officers are still active and eager to participate in implementation of Component 4 hence training and implementation of the FFS is anticipated to be smooth and very efficient. For Component 4, at least 2 trainers will participate in the regional training for IPPMFFS in cotton such as the project *“Supporting competitiveness and sustainable intensification of African cotton sectors through capacity development on Integrated Production and Pest Management.”*

C. Describe the budgeted M&E Plan

Oversight and reviews

Project oversight will be carried out by the Project Steering Committee and FAO. Project oversight will be facilitated by: (i) documenting project transactions and results through traceability of related documents throughout the implementation of the project; (ii) ensuring that the project is implemented within the planned activities applying established standards and guidelines; (iii) continuous identification and monitoring of project risks and risk mitigation strategies; and (iv) ensuring project outputs are produced in accordance with the project results framework. At any time during project execution, underperforming subcomponents may be required to undergo additional assessments, implementation changes to improve performance or be halted until remedies have been identified and implemented.

Monitoring responsibilities

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of progress in achieving project results and objectives will be done based on the targets and results indicators established in the project results framework and annual work plans and budgets. M&E activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. The M&E plan, which has been budgeted at USD 190,000 will be reviewed and updated during the project inception phase. This will involve: (i) review of the project's results framework; (ii) refining of outcome indicators, as necessary; (iii) identification of missing baseline information and action to be taken to collect the information; and (iv) clarification of M&E roles and responsibilities of project stakeholders. The project's M&E system will be put in place within the first 6 months of project implementation.

The day-to-day monitoring of project implementation will be the responsibility of the Project Management Unit led by a part time Chief Technical Advisor (40%), working closely with a full time National Project Coordinator and driven by the preparation and implementation of annual work plans and budgets (AWP/B) and six-monthly project progress reports (PPRs). The preparation of the AWP/B and six-monthly PPRs will represent the product of a unified planning process between main project partners. As tools for results-based-management (RBM), the AWP/B will identify activities for the coming project year and provide the necessary details on output targets to be achieved. The PPRs will report on the monitoring of the implementation of activities and the achievement of output targets. An annual project progress review and planning meeting should be organized by the Project Management Unit with the participation of representatives from key executing partners prior to the Project Steering Committee Meeting. The AWP/B and PPRs will be submitted to the PSC for approval (AWP/B) and Review (PPRs) and to FAO for approval. The AWP/B will be developed in a manner consistent with the project's Results Framework to ensure adequate fulfilment and monitoring of project outputs and outcomes.

Indicators and information sources

To monitor project outputs and outcomes including contributions to global environmental benefits, specific indicators have been established in the Results Framework (see Appendix 1 in the FAO project document). The framework's indicators and means of verification will be applied to monitor both project performance and impact. Following FAO's monitoring procedures and progress reporting formats, data collected will be of sufficient detail to be able to track specific outputs and outcomes and flag project risks early on. Output target indicators will be monitored on a six-monthly basis and outcome target indicators will be monitored on an annual basis if possible or as part of the mid-term and final evaluations.

Monitoring information sources will be evidence of outputs (tonnages disposed, % reduction in soil contamination, reports, website, farmer surveys, lists of participants in training activities, manuals etc.). To assess and confirm the congruence of outcomes with project objectives, physical inspection and/or surveying of activity sites and participants will be carried out. This latter task would often be

undertaken by the PMU supported by the FAO Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and Lead Technical Unit (LTU).

Data collected from the participants of the container management programmes (Component 2); the baseline survey on pest and pesticide management practices and information gathered in rolling out the communication (Component 4) all will be important inputs for the relevant indicators in the Results Framework.

Reports and their schedule

Specific reports that will be prepared under the M&E program are the: project inception report; Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B); Project Progress Reports (PPRs); annual project implementation review (PIR); technical reports; co-financing reports; and a terminal report. In addition, assessment of the GEF POPs tracking tool against the baseline will be required at mid-term and final evaluation.

Project Inception Report: After FAO approval of the project and signature of the FAO/Government Cooperative Programme (GCP) Agreement, the project will initiate with a six month inception period. An inception workshop will be held and immediately after the workshop, the CTA will prepare a project inception report in consultation with the National Project Coordinator and FAO LTO and other project partners. The report will include a narrative on the institutional roles and responsibilities and coordinating action of project partners, progress to date on project establishment and start-up activities and an update of any changed external conditions that may affect project implementation. It will also include a detailed First Year Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B) and a supervision plan with all monitoring and supervision requirements. The draft report will be circulated to FAO and the Project Steering Committee for review and comments before its finalization. The report should be cleared by the FAO Budget Holder (FAO Malawi), Lead Technical Officer, Lead Technical Unit and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit and uploaded in FPMIS by the BH.

Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B): The National Project Coordinator will submit to the FAO LTO, LTU, and BH a draft Annual Work Plan and Budget. The AWP/B, divided into monthly timeframes, should include detailed activities to be implemented and outputs (targets and milestones for output indicators) to be achieved during the year. A detailed project budget for the activities to be implemented during the year should also be included together with all monitoring and supervision activities required during the year. The draft AWP/B should be further discussed at annual planning meetings with key executing partners. The National Project Coordinator will incorporate eventual comments and the final AWP/B will be sent to the PSC for approval and to FAO BH for final no-objection and upload in FPMIS by the GEF Coordination Unit.

Project Progress Reports: One month before the mid-point of each project year, Chief Technical Adviser will prepare in close collaboration with the National Project Coordinator a semi-annual Project Progress Report (PPR). The report will contain the following: (i) an account of actual implementation of project activities compared to those scheduled in the AWP/B; (ii) an account of the achievement of outputs and progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (based on the indicators contained in the results framework); (iii) identification of any problems and constraints (technical, human, financial, etc.) encountered in project implementation and the reasons for these constraints; (iv) clear recommendations for corrective actions in addressing key problems resulting in lack of progress in achieving results; (v) lessons learned; and (vi) a revised work plan for the final six months of the project year. The report will also include an estimate of cofinancing received from all co-financing partners.

The PPR will be submitted by the National Project Coordinator to FAO no later than one month after the end of each six-monthly reporting period (30 June and 31 December). The draft PPR will be reviewed and cleared by FAO (BH and LTO). The LTO will submit the PPR to the GEF Coordination Unit for final clearance. The final PPR will be circulated by the BH to the PSC.

Project Implementation Review: The LTO supported by the FAO LTU, with inputs from the Chief Technical Adviser, National Project Coordinator will prepare an annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) covering the period July (the previous year) through June (current year). The PIR will be submitted to the GEF Coordination in TCI for review and approval no later than 31 July. The GEF Coordination will submit the final report to the GEF Secretariat and Evaluation Office as part of the Annual Monitoring Review report of the FAO-GEF portfolio.

Technical Reports: Technical reports will be prepared to document and share project outcomes and lessons learned. The drafts of any technical reports must be submitted by the Project Coordinator to the FAO BH in Malawi who will share it with the LTO for review and clearance, prior to finalization and publication. Copies of the technical reports will be distributed to the Project Steering Committee and other project partners as appropriate. These will be posted on the FAO FPMIS by the LTO.

Co-financing Reports: The National Project Coordinator will be responsible for collecting the required information and reporting on in-kind and cash co-financing provided by all co-financing partners. The National Project Coordinator will provide the information in a timely manner and will transmit such information to FAO. The co-financing reports should be completed as part of the semi-annual PPRs and annual PIRs.

GEF-5 Tracking Tools: Following the GEF policies and procedures, the tracking tools for POPs will be submitted at three moments: (i) with the project document at CEO endorsement; (ii) at project mid-term evaluation; and (iii) at final evaluation. These should be completed by Project Coordinator with support from the LTO at mid-term and final evaluation.

Terminal Report: Within two months of the project completion date the National Project Coordinator will submit to FAO a draft Terminal Report, including a list of outputs detailing the activities taken under the Project, “lessons learned” and any recommendations to improve the efficiency of similar activities in the future. This report will specifically include the findings of the final evaluation.

Monitoring and evaluation plan summary

Type of monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Time frame	Budget
Inception Workshop	Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), National Project Coordinator (NPC), Project Steering Committee, FAO (FAO Malawi as Budget Holder - BH, FAO Lead Technical Officer and Technical Unit-LTO and LTU, FAO GEF Coordination Unit).	Within first two months of project start up.	USD 22,500
Inception report	CTA with inputs from project partners.	Immediately after the project inception workshop	USD 2,500
	Cleared by FAO LTO, LTU, BH and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, and the Project Steering Committee.		
Technical coordination and oversight	CTA	Continuously	USD 20,000
Design and implementation of monitoring and evaluation system, including staff training	M&E with support from the CTA and FAO LTO and LTU.	Within the first six months after the project inception	USD 8,500

Type of monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Time frame	Budget
Field-based impact monitoring	M&E expert with support from NPC– local NGOs, farmers/producers associations.	Continually	USD 11,500
Incorporation of M&E results into communication material	Communication and M&E experts	Twice in the project duration	USD 12,950
Technical support and backstopping missions	FAO LTO/LTU.	Annual or as required.	Paid by GEF Agency fee
Supervision missions	Independent missions organized by TCI/GEF Coordination Unit	Annual or as necessary	Paid by GEF Agency fee
Project progress reports (PPRs)	CTA in collaboration with NPC	Six- monthly	USD 10,000
	Submitted to the BH and LTU for clearance. Finalized reports submitted to the FAO GEF Unit by the LTO, and to the PSC by the PC.		
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	FAO LTO with inputs from the NPC, BH and LTU. Submitted by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit to the GEF Secretariat. Final report also submitted to the PSC and the GEF Operational Focal Point.	Annually	Paid by GEF Agency fee
Reports on co-financing	NPC with information from all co-financing partners.	Six monthly and annually as part of PPR and PIR.	USD 3,500
PSC meetings	CTA, NPC, PSC Chair, FAO Budget Holder	At least once a year	USD 12,000
Technical reports	CTA, NPC, Consultants, FAO LTO/LTU	As appropriate	From component budgets
Mid- term evaluation	External consultant(s), arranged by the FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project partners, the FAO BH, LTO, LTU and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit.	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 40,000
Final evaluation	External consultant(s), arranged by the FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project partners, the FAO BH, LTO, LTU and	At the end of project implementation	USD 40,000
Terminal report	PMU, FAO LTO	Within two months before end of project	USD 6,550
Total			USD 190,000

PROVISION FOR EVALUATIONS

An independent Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) will be undertaken at project mid-term (end of second or beginning of third year) to evaluate progress and effectiveness of implementation in terms of achieving the project objective, outcomes and outputs. Findings and recommendations of this evaluation will be instrumental for bringing improvement in the overall project design and execution strategy for the remaining period of the project's term if necessary. The FAO Evaluation Office will arrange for the MTE in consultation with the project partners. The evaluation will, *inter alia*:

- (i) review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
- (ii) analyze effectiveness of partnership arrangements;
- (iii) identify issues requiring decisions and remedial actions;
- (iv) propose any mid-course corrections and/or adjustments to the implementation strategy as necessary; and
- (v) highlight technical achievements and lessons learned derived from project design, implementation and management.

An independent Final Evaluation (FE) will be carried out three months prior to the terminal review meeting of the project partners. The FE, which will be organized by the FAO Evaluation Office, would aim to identify the project impacts and sustainability of project results and the degree of achievement of long-term results. This Evaluation would also have the purpose of indicating future actions needed to sustain project results and disseminate products and best-practices within and outside the region.

Part III: Approval/Endorsement by GEF Operational Focal Point(s) and GEF Agency(ies)

- A. Record of endorsement of GEF operational point(s) on behalf of the government(s):** (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter with this form. For SGP, use the OFP endorsement letter).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Dr. Aloysius M. Kamperewera: Kamphatso1@gmail.com Tel: +265 1 771 111 Mobile; +265 888 869 446	Director ; IAEA National Liaison Officer and GEF Operational Focal Point	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE MANAGEMENT	08/28/2012

B. GEF Agency(ies) Certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy		August 26, 2014	Francesca Mancini	+3906 570 54572	Francesca.Mancini@fao.org

Annex 1: Project Results Framework. (either copy and paste the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found)

Please see Appendix 1 in the FAO Project Document on page 57. A detailed results budget is presented in Appendix 3 on page 73.

Annex B: Responses to Project Reviews (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF)

STAP Review – comments at PIF	Response
<p>Given dependence on rainfall, as well as other climate change impacts on pest species (eg. their prevalence and range of impact at any given time), these and other such elements that might be affected by climate change need to be carefully considered in designing IPM. Also, are extreme El Nino and La Nina events indicators for the likelihood of locust invasions? Elements such as this need consideration during formulation of the project, to build resilience into the national IPM systems created for the country.</p>	<p>Building the resilience of farming systems to environmental shocks and stresses such as climate variability, will be at the core of the FFS IPM component, Specifically, farmers will be trained in collecting and analysing data through the ecosystem analysis approach to understand the impact of environmental factors on production and plant health, adaptive management strategies will be tested and the best practices disseminated further. Findings at field level will inform the development of a national IPM policy.</p>

Annex C: Status of implementation of project preparation activities and the use of funds⁶

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: USD 75 000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1. First multi-stakeholder consultation	10,000	3,538.04	3,538.04
2. Design of a draft strategy for the disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides stocks; and identification of priority contaminated sites	0	849.72	
3. Preparation of a draft container management strategy	11,560	5,636.37	1,004.50
4. Identification of gaps in existing legislation and capacity building needs for sound pesticide management	2,250	13,826.265	
5. Preparation of a strategy for the promotion of alternatives to POPs pesticides including endosulfan	15,760	8,693.66	4,018
6. Detailed design of project components based on incremental reasoning, risk analysis, financing plan and institutional and implementation arrangements	20,430	11,473.24	16,272.88
7. Final multi-stakeholder consultations	15,000	2,783	3,253.44
TOTAL	75,000	46,800.30	17,087

⁶ Some of the PPG activities, such as design of a draft disposal strategy, were funded through the Japan-funded project.

Annex D: Calendar of expected reflows (if non-grant instrument is used)

N/A