



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

Project Type: Full-sized Project

Type of Trust Fund: GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Disposal Of Obsolete Pesticides Including Pops And Implementation Of Integrated Pest And Pesticide Management Programme In Morocco			
Country	Morocco	GEF Project ID	4738
GEF Agency	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	613563
Other Executing Partner(s)	Ministry of Agriculture, Environment and Health	Submission Date:	March 27, 2014
GEF Focal Area(s):	Chemicals – POPs	Project Duration (Months)	48 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Agency Fee (\$):	350,000

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. 800 tonnes of obsolete pesticides including POPs and 10 highly contaminated sites remediated.	GEFTF	3,500,000	24,246,626
Total Project Costs				3,500,000	24,246,626

B. Project Framework

Project Objective: To reduce POPs releases from obsolete pesticide stockpiles and contaminated sites and strengthen the capacity for the sound management of pesticides						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
Component 1: Safe disposal of	TA	<u>Outcome 1.1:</u> Risks to human health and the	1.1 Safeguarding and	GEFTF	2,060,800	13,134,300

POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of heavily contaminated sites		<p>environment reduced through safe disposal of POPs and other obsolete pesticides and remediation of pesticide-contaminated soil</p> <p><i>Main indicators:</i> a) 800 Tonnes of POPs and other OP safeguarded/disposed and average cost b) 10 heavily contaminated sites remediated c) % decline in contaminants in soil (target to be determined in remediation plans).</p>	<p>disposal strategy in line with national and international best practice developed.</p> <p>1.2 Safeguarding, export and destruction of inventoried wastes (800 tonnes⁴) completed in an environmentally sound manner.</p> <p>1.3 10 priority contaminated sites remediated.</p>			
Component 2: Management of empty pesticide containers	TA	<p>Outcome 2.1 : Reduce health and environmental risks associated with empty pesticide containers and their reuse.</p> <p><i>Main indicators:</i> a) Number of empty containers triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling; % of all containers collected/buried/reused (targets: 90% of containers generated annually triple rinsed, collected and stored awaiting recycling; 0% reused) b) National policy / action plan based on pilot adopted by ONSSA</p>	<p>2.1 Container management pilot implemented in Sous Massa.</p> <p>2.2 Handover of Sous Massa pilot scheme to a permanent operator completed.</p> <p>2.3 National strategy for container management developed.</p>	GEFTF	235,000	3,882,500
Component 3: Institutional and technical capacities for registration and post-	TA	<p>Outcome 3.1: Institutional and technical capacities for registration and post-registration system are enhanced</p>	<p>3.1 Pesticide management legislation and registration system revised in conformity with the Code and EU</p>	GEFTF	380,000	4,221,039

⁴ The project allows a 1% margin in case of changes to the inventory in the intervening years. Newly accumulated stockpiles are not included in this inventory or project.

registration		<u>Main indicators:</u> a) <i>Legislation and registration for all pesticides in compliance with Code / EU Regulation adopted.</i> b) <i>Less than 5% of non-conforming/ total number samples taken at Casablanca port border</i> c) <i>Information exchanged by compliance and enforcement institutions</i>	regulations and submitted for approval. 3.2 Pilot pesticide import control system implemented at Casablanca port 3.3 Chemical Analysis and Research Laboratory (LOARC) analytical capacity enhanced (at least 4 lab staff trained, waste management strategy for the lab developed and operational). 3.4 Mechanism for information exchange on pesticide quality and food safety established. (at least 8 institutions share information on compliance promotion activities)			
Component 4: Promotion of alternatives to reduce the use of conventional chemical pesticides	TA	<u>Outcome 4.1</u> Reduced use of conventional chemical pesticides through promotion of alternatives <u>Main indicators:</u> a) <i>% of network farmers using alternatives (e.g. IPM) and HHP/POPs (at least 50% increase in the use of alternatives)</i>	4.1 Output 4.1 Typology study conducted and alternatives identified in Souss Massa. 4.2 Alternatives tested and promoted to at least 300 farmers and extension service providers	GEFTF	453,500	1,257,537
Component 5: Knowledge Management, Monitoring and Evaluation	TA	<u>Outcome 5.1:</u> Project monitored and evaluated effectively and best practices disseminated	5.1 Project monitoring system providing six-monthly reports on progress in achieving project outputs and outcomes. 5.2 Midterm and final evaluation reports 5.3 Project “best-practices” and “lessons-learned”	GEFTF	126,000	50,000

			disseminated via publications, project website and others.			
Subtotal					3,255,300	22,545,376
Project management Cost (PMC)					244,700	1,701,250
Total project costs					3,500,000	24,246,626

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 (ONSSA)	In-kind	8,300,000
Government	Ministry of Agriculture (ONSSA)	Grant	1,000,000
Government	National Desert Locust Control Centre (CNLAA)	In-Kind	9,000,000
Government	Ministry of Health	In-kind	1,600,000
Government	Ministry of Health	Grant	250,000
Private Sector	Croplife International	Grant	1,814,500
Private Sector	Croplife International	In-kind	1,005,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	1,277,126
Total Co-financing			24,246,626

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	Morocco	3,500,000	350,000	3,850,000
Total Grant Resources				3,850,000	350,000	3,850,000

F. Consultants Working for Technical Assistance Components:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants ⁵	408,000	612,000	1,020,000
National/Local Consultants	249,288	424,000	673,288

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

⁵ International consultants include regional consultants.

Part II: Project Justification

A. Describe any changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF⁶

1. The arrangements for Component 1 are that the outreach and safeguarding of the 800 tonnes of obsolete stocks is to be undertaken with funds provided by Croplife and that the international shipment and disposal will be covered by GEF funds. The original PIF budget for Component 1 underestimated disposal costs significantly (USD 1 750 per tonne compared with FAO's recent contract of obsolete DDT of USD 2 200 per tonne). To manage this discrepancy, an additional USD 469 000 of GEF funds is required for Component 1. The major reallocation from Component 3 (reduced from USD 700 000 to USD 380 000) resulted from the significant co-finance from the EC project on regulatory and legislative review. A smaller reduction in component 4 has also been made due to the change in strategy described below.

2. The project framework in the PIF included the regulatory framework for pesticide management together with chemical use reduction in one component. Due to the significant differences between these two activities, in terms of beneficiaries, responsible entities, and outputs, the PIF project Outcomes 3.1 *"Institutional and technical capacities strengthened for the enforcement of registration and post-registration systems in line with Code of Conduct on the distribution and use of pesticides"* and 3.2 *"Decreased use of conventional chemicals and increased uptake of alternatives"* have been separated into components 3 and 4 respectively.

3. The PIF Outputs 3.1.3 (*Database on registered and banned pesticides updated after every deliberation by the national registration committee and made available to all partners*) and 3.1.4 (*Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS) network deployed on pesticides import, current stocks with respective quality and use of pesticides*) have been combined into the current Output 3.4 (*Mechanism for information exchange on pesticide quality and food safety established*), which does not pre-select any particular mechanism such as PSMS but enables the project to better respond to stakeholders expressed needs and preferences, in order to make any system more likely to continue after project end.

4. The PIF Component 4 included curriculum development on Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and Farmers Field Schools (FFS), but since the PPG identified a number of previous and on-going IPM initiatives which have already developed relevant curricula and materials, and since the project will not actually roll out any FFS itself, this activity has been adapted to focus more on field demonstration and peer-to-peer exchanges, rather than possibly duplicating training materials for which no immediate use is assured.

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 800 tonnes of existing obsolete pesticides and remediate ten heavily contaminated priority sites. To prevent future mismanagement, focus will also be on strengthening institutional capacity to enforce pesticide regulations⁷.

⁶ 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.

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 1.2a 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 1.2c 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

Description of risk	Ranking	Mitigation measures	Responsibility
Institutional arrangements pose challenges related to execution of the project	Low	The project was prepared in a participatory manner by the relevant ministerial departments, FAO and a national steering committee was set up. All partners agreed on the host institution to be ONSSA. Lessons learned from ASP in designing the execution arrangements. As such full-time staff will be funded by the project and assigned to the project.	Project Steering Committee, Project Implementation Committee.
Potential for political instability	Low	There is currently no apparent sign of political unrest.	Government, PSC
Environmental contamination from leakage of POPs and other obsolete pesticides due to poor conditions of containers.	Medium	Management measures to be included in the EMP include field procedures to ensure no further leakage occurs during the project activities. Chemical stores will be ranked according to leakage risk at the beginning of the project, and will be safe-guarded as a matter of priority.	PMU, Croplife
Monitoring staff being exposed to pesticides during collection and repacking of empty containers.	Low to medium	A national team was trained under ASP in safety, monitoring and handling procedures. Refresher training will be conducted prior to safeguarding and disposal operations, and Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) provided for all personnel involved in safeguarding.	PMU, FAO
Insufficient funds for safeguarding of major contaminated sites, the disposal of POPs and other project activities	Medium	Through the strategy and tender development, and close collaboration with Croplife who will be doing the safeguarding, the project will be able to respond to any changes to the existing inventory and ensure that priority sites are repackaged. Contacts with other donors (African Development Bank and Islamic Development Bank) will continue to avoid possible problems with financing.	PMU, PSC, Croplife
Insufficient national capacity in undertaking evaluation and decontamination of pesticide contaminated sites	High	Capable institution(s) will be contracted to carry out decontamination operations working together with a national team in order to impart expertise on in situ soil remediation. .	PMU, Project Implementation Committee

Climate risks such as floods, crop calendars disruption or increase of pest invasions	Medium	<p>Emergency sites will be primarily safeguarded during the driest months with a view to reducing risks associated with torrential rainfall. Contingency plans, especially targeting removal of excess water accumulated in the holding areas, will be implemented in the event of torrential rains. Selection criteria for collection centres for safeguarded stocks will include an assessment of flood risk.</p> <p>Crop timing changes such as delaying planting dates and shortening crop production cycle might affect implementation of some activities planned under component 4. To monitor climate conditions and potential impacts on the project, the project will access agro-meteorological information from the National Meteorological Service and INRA (Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique).</p>	Project Management Unit,
Low existing use and uptake of alternative technologies by producers.	Low	<p>A large-scale information and awareness-raising campaign about the modes of application and effectiveness of the proposed alternatives will be undertaken to help promote uptake of alternatives.</p> <p>Another strategy is to employ existing farmer field schools networks. The promotion of IPM through FFS has been quite successful in previous related initiatives.</p>	PMU, NGO partners, government extension partners.
Poisonings among the agents involved in the collection and re-grouping of un-rinsed empty pesticide containers.	Medium	Training modules revolving around technologies for the safe collection and re-grouping of these wastes will be specifically designed for the pilot project agents.	Project Management Unit, NDLCC, APEEFEL.
Pesticide companies/ distributors and farmers do not support the project.	Low	The project has involved and will continue to involve the private sector and producers associations in all the processes related to the project implementation. The necessary advocacy actions will be undertaken in the context of the project communication strategy	Project Management Unit, NDLCC, APEEFEL.
Customs noncompliance as regards the implementation of the pesticides control system at entry points.	Low	Awareness-raising/ Obtaining the formal commitment of the Ministry of Finance (Customs). Customs' involvement into the development of the new control system.	Project Management Unit, Project Steering Committee.
Insufficient budget to meet the needs of LOARC so that it can undertake all the analyses of pesticides in accordance with the WHO / FAO specifications	Low	Commitment from the relevant ministry (Ministry of Agriculture) to bear the costs of the needed laboratory equipment.	Project Management Unit, Ministry of Agriculture, ONSSA.

A.7 Coordination with other GEF financed initiatives

With funding from GEF, Morocco is currently reviewing and updating its national implementation plan for the Stockholm Convention with UNEP's support. The proposed project will provide information to the NIP update process through the project steering committee, and participation of the Department of Environment – the lead agency for the NIP update – in the implementation of the project.

The project will also be closely coordinated with three similar GEF-financed initiatives in Benin, Cameroon and CILSS mainly through the FAO Lead Technical Unit (the Pesticide Risk Reduction Group in the Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) which 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

Stakeholders and their specific role in the project are described in section 1.4 and section 4.2 in the FAO project document.

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be established to provide high level consultation and oversight to overall project implementation. The committee will be chaired by the National Food Safety Board Food Safety Authority, Ministry of Agriculture ONSSA and will include representatives from all implementation partners including the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Interior (the General Directorate of Local Governments and the Moroccan National Centre for Locust Control (CNLAA), the Ministry of Industry and Commerce, the Ministry of Equipment and Transport, farmers/producers organizations, NGOs, the civil society, and the private sector. The committee will meet annually or more frequent as necessary. The PSC will be supported by the Project Management Unit (PMU) which will be responsible for the day to day management of the project.

To allow for the involvement of other key ministries in the management of the project, in addition to the Project Coordinator, the PMU will include liaison officers from each of the three ministries, who will support the project in accessing relevant technical expertise and informing government counterparts of the project's progress.

The project will work with a number of partners (e.g. Association Marocaine des Producteurs et Producteurs Exportateurs de Fruits et Légumes (APEFEL), Croplife and Pesticide Action Network Maroc) who will contribute to the execution of specific components/outputs through MoUs or Letters of Agreement. The partners will be part of component teams set-up to enhance engagement of key stakeholders, to access a variety of skills needed to implement the components, and to capitalize on networks and channels of communication already established.

At local community/Farmer level, the project will work with APEFEL, the Moroccan Association of Citrus Producers (ASPAM), the Association of Packagers and Exporters of Strawberries (AMCEF), the Moroccan Banana Producers Association (APROBA), who will raise awareness of their members about project activities and contribute towards the execution of components 2 and 4 on container management and alternatives, particularly the establishment of the farmer network and demonstration plots.

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, and d) enhancing the quality of products through better control of pesticides in their life cycle, ultimately reducing pesticide residues.

Project activities will identify specific needs and concerns of both professional and smallholder women farmers through the typology of farmers study; and specifically target them in training and awareness-raising activities including empty pesticide containers and alternatives.

Agricultural production carried out with fewer inputs in compliance with IPM approach leads to reduced costs (in inputs) in producing high quality crops that are highly competitive within the international marketplace. In addition, the clean-up of POPs and highly hazardous pesticides is considered an investment to address legacy issues. However, the project has taken seriously the need to prevent the further accumulation of such legacy issues, and therefore included activities related to enforcement and inspection and quality control of pesticide products, helping the Government of Morocco to ensure that banned POPs do not find their way back onto agricultural black markets.

Component 2 on container management will demonstrate the technical and financial viability of such a scheme. Since the project preparation phase, the project has actively involved the private sector with a view to ensuring both that the pilot in Sous Massa will continue after the project; and that a national strategy will be adopted by the government for the scheme to be scaled-up. Morocco plans to introduce an 'EcoTax' on plastic containers starting 2014 which will be important in ensuring the financial viability of the scheme.

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

With regard to Component 1 on disposal and remediation, one of the things considered was to conduct an inventory update given that the last inventory was conducted about five years ago. This would mean some of the resources available would be allocated to inventory update and a delay in disposal to allow for the completion of the inventory update. The Government insisted that the component should focus only on dealing with the 2009 inventoried stocks and contaminated sites, because delayed disposal and increased environmental contamination through continued release of source chemicals will lead to higher future clean up costs. Contaminated soil will be treated locally instead of exporting it.

For Component 2, in designing the container management scheme, it has been proposed to use existing infrastructure i.e. the Desert Locust Control empty container management facility in Tiznit for metal containers, and another facility for plastic containers in El Gara, instead of setting up all new infrastructure for empty containers from agriculture. Also, the pilot will be located in an area that generates the largest quantities of empty pesticide containers, therefore the highest potential impact on pesticide waste reduction in Morocco.

Overall, the strategy is to invest the resources on activities and areas where there will be a significant impact and the likelihood of sustainability and replication, with an understanding that the project alone would not be able to deal with each and every pesticide management issue in the country.

As mentioned, there are three other GEF-funded POPs projects in Benin, Cameroon, and Morocco for which FAO is the GEF agency. The proposed project is closely related to these projects – they have similar components. Through the FAO Lead Technical Unit and Project Task Forces, these will be closely coordinated and opportunities to implement some activities, such as training, could be combined (depending on the pace of implementation of these projects).

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 the 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 126,000 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; (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 the project implementation will be the responsibility of the Project Management Unit led by the 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 the actions proposed for the coming project year and provide the necessary details on output targets to be achieved, and the PPRs will report on the monitoring of the implementation of actions 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 (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).

The network of farmers to be established under component 4 (Typology Study) will also be an important source of information for the M&E system. Data collected from the network on participation in the container management system, on knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) and knowledge and opinions on communications activities will be important inputs for the relevant indicators in the Results Framework.

Reports and their schedule

The 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 Project Coordinator will prepare a project inception report in consultation with the FAO Lead Technical Officer (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 (BH) (FAO Morocco), LTO, LTU and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit and uploaded in FPMIS by the BH.

Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B): The Project Coordinator will submit to the FAO LTO an 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 is circulated to and reviewed by the FAO Project Task Force, Project Coordinator incorporates eventual comments and the final AWP/B is 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, the Project Coordinator will prepare 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; (iv) lessons learned; and (v) 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 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 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 Morocco 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 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 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 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 as described above.

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.

Monitoring and evaluation plan summary

Type of monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Time frame	Budget
Inception Workshop	Project Coordinator, Project Steering Committee, FAO (FAO Morocco as Budget Holder - BH, FAO Lead Technical Officer and Technical Unit- LTO and LTU, FAO GEF Coordination Unit)	Within first two months of project inception	USD 30,000
Inception report	Project Coordinator (PC) with inputs from project partners. Cleared by FAO LTO, LTU, BH and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, and the Project Steering Committee.	Immediately after the project inception workshop	USD 1,500
Design and implementation of monitoring and evaluation system, including staff training	PC with support from FAO LTO and LTU.	Within the first six months after the project inception	USD 1,500
Field-based impact monitoring	PC with support from other project partners – local NGOs, farmers/producers associations.	Continually	USD 3,000
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)	Project Coordinator. 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.	Six- monthly	USD 3,000
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	FAO LTO with inputs from the PC, 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

Type of monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Time frame	Budget
Reports on co-financing	PC with information from all co-financing partners.	Six monthly and annually as part of PPR and PIR.	USD 1,500
PSC meetings	Project Coordinator, PSC Chair, FAO Budget Holder	At least once a year	USD 5,000
Technical reports	PC, Consultants, FAO LTO/LTU	As appropriate	from component budgets
Mid-term evaluation	PMU, GEF, FAO LTO, LTU in consultation with the project team and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 39,500
Final evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team and other partners	At the end of project implementation	USD 39,500
Terminal report	PMU, FAO LTO	At least one month before end of project	USD 1,500
			USD 126,000

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 review 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)
Mr. Mohamed BENYAHIA Email address: benyahia@environnement.gov.ma	GEF Operational Focal Point Director of Partnership, Communications & Cooperation	Ministry of Energy Mining, Water & Environment Number 9, Avenue Al Araar Secteur 16 Hay Riad Rabat - 10000 Morocco Tel: 011 212 37 57 66 65 Fax: 011 212 37 57 04 68	09, 12, 2011

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		March 27, 2014	Richard Thompson	+3906 5705 2725	Richard.Thompson@fao.org
Barbara Cooney FAO GEF Coordinator Email: Barbara.Cooney@fao.org Tel: +3906 5705 5478					

Annex A: **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 47. A detailed results budget is presented in Appendix 3 on page 59.

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>a) The document recognises the role of women in agriculture, and addresses the repurposing of pesticide containers for domestic uses. It appropriately targets men AND women in planned Farmer Field School activities. The STAP also hopes that care will be taken to identify specific differences in the roles of men and women in the crop cycle, and related chemicals use. For example, men may administer the pesticides to crops, and be recipient of safety equipment, but women may do more weeding and gathering of crops after pesticide treatments have been carried out, increasing their exposure, and calling for specific guidance on how best to protect themselves, and any juveniles that may accompany them in the fields. This latter comment is only offered as a thought-starter, as the STAP does NOT have a social scientist onboard, and so does not claim authority on gender roles in Morocco. Still, extension training might consider these things. Also, the dangers of informal, repurposed use of POPs containing containers are indeed acknowledged, and targeted awareness in communities may have a large gender component, such that mechanism of delivery of message should take culturally-specific best practices in delivering key information to men or women (eg if women do water collection and other gathering of food etc using repurposed containers).</p>	<p>Specific difference in the roles of men, women and children in the cropping cycle, and their related exposure to chemicals is addressed in component 4. Field data on farming and pest control practices from a representative farmers network in Sous Massa, based on agro-ecological zones, size of the farm and production factors (access to agricultural inputs, equipment and labour), and type of farmer, with purposeful sampling of both professional and smallholder female farmers. The project will thus identify pest control practices and the respective roles of men and women in prescription, purchase, transport storage, preparation, application and conditions of application of pesticides, other farming practices, containers management and disposal of remaining stocks throughout the cropping cycle. Analysis of this data will identify best farming practices for reducing exposure to pesticides by men, women and children involved in or impacted by farming. These best practices will be fed back into the communications and extension strategies to promote sustainable farming practices, and shared internationally.</p> <p>Information from the typology study which, as mentioned, will identify the respective roles of men and women in the management of empty pesticide containers (among other aspects), will guide the design and implementation of the container management component 2. The farmer training and awareness programme will take gender roles into account.</p> <p>Risks from empty pesticides containers is addressed in component 2, by changing behaviours of male and female farmers through the promotion of “triple rinsing” and puncturing of containers once the contents have been used. Triple rinsing ensures that residual contamination on the surfaces of containers is reduced to the extent that the containers no longer represent a gross hazard. Puncturing the containers renders them unusable and avoids the risks of them being used for the storage of food and water for human or animal consumption. It also avoids them accumulating stagnant rain water and becoming a potential breeding ground for disease vectors.</p>
<p>b) The document acknowledges that</p>	<p>FAO recently did a case study on the West African</p>

<p>IPM has been largely unsuccessful in uptake, but this may be because apart from poorly coordinated previous efforts, and incomplete buy-in from stakeholders, IPM efforts may not have satisfactorily addressed the very real threats experienced from the desert locust, phytosanitary-related pest control demands etc. The document is not clear about the full range of possible reasons for previous failures, nor does it elaborate what differences will be made in the project's approach to IPM. But given FAO's extensive field experience in Africa and the rest of the globe, and the undoubted plan to apply lessons learned to improve IPM uptake this time round, the STAP would like to see FAO include its achievements, and how they will be applied in Morocco, in the eventual project document.</p>	<p>Regional Integrated Production and Pest Management (IPPM) Programme (which started in 2001), looking at results of the programme and highlighting key elements necessary for sustaining and scaling up IPM.</p> <p>To highlight some of the results: more than 4,000 cotton farmers in Mali were shown, from cotton company sales records, to have reduced their purchase of highly hazardous pesticides by 92%, and kept it low over an 8-year period. Cotton yields also increased – from between 14 to 70% for farmers that have received IPM training and adopted IPM practices.</p> <p>There are a number of key elements that contributed to the success of the programme, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the approach used in transferring IPM to farmers – experiential learning through Farmer Field Schools; - institutional buy-in with a diversity of government agencies and farmer organizations - effective communication strategy. <p>An independent evaluation of another FAO regional IPM project (with Morocco one of the countries) made a number of recommendations (quite similar to the case study) for the successful promotion of IPM which have been reflected in the project design. These include: strengthening institutional collaboration at the local and national levels to help institutionalize IPM, strong involvement of the extension staff of the Ministry of Agriculture to facilitate up and out-scaling of IPM and participation of local and national NGOs, research institutes and agricultural universities as well as collaboration with ministries of health, education and economy.</p> <p>Institutional buy-in is fundamental for scaling-up because it would not be possible to finance, through a pilot, training of all farmers in one country. There has to be support from the Government, reflected in their policy and budgets. This is an opportune time for this project because the newly established farmer advisory service (Office regional mise en valeur agricole de sous messa) is taking on IPM and FFS as key tools to promote agriculture and add value to the production chain.</p> <p>In designing the project we also looked at the successful phase-out of methyl bromide used for soil fumigation for tomato production in Morocco. UNIDO supported the Government of Morocco, working with the Moroccan Association of Fruit and Vegetable producers and Exporters (APEFEL), to set up an applied research and demonstration centre where farmers see</p>
---	--

	<p>alternatives at work. This centre is operated by APEFEL.</p> <p>APEFEL and other farmer associations will be instrumental in promoting alternatives to other highly hazardous pesticides to their members. For this reason APEFEL, the Moroccan Association of Citrus Producers (ASPAM), the Association of Packagers and Exporters of Strawberries (AMCEF), the Moroccan Banana Producers Association (APROBA), will directly participate in the execution of component 4 on alternatives.</p>
<p>c) Hopefully issues such as climate change impacts on pest species, their prevalence and range of impact and the like, might be overtly considered as the agency designs the IPM programme under the project (eg. Are extreme El Nino and La Nina events indicators for the likelihood of locust invasions?). Clearly laying out how this was done would then serve as a template for subsequent projects in the portfolio, making for better streamlining of similar activities based on FAOs extensive experience.</p>	<p>This is an interesting and important question.</p> <p>FAO is managing a Desert Locust Information Service (DLIS). DLIS produces monthly situation summaries and forecasts for each country including Morocco, and sends warnings and alerts about potential invasions. The locust forecasts incorporate seasonal rainfall and temperature predictions. The project will look at how to integrate this information into the programme.</p> <p>The evidence-based approach to selection of suitable alternatives (which must be relevant to the climatic and ecological conditions of Morocco) in Outcome 4 will include consideration and documentation of climate factors as far as possible, in relation to agricultural timings and pest pressures. Any templates developed to co-monitor climate with agricultural and agronomic practices would be adaptable and shared widely.</p>
<p>d) Morocco has a number of laboratories that could play a bigger role, especially in characterising and prioritising contaminated sites, and monitoring remediation using the local technologies for remediation. Remediation might take longer than the project duration, and by establishing a monitoring programme based on these laboratories will support ongoing remediation efforts and provide impetus for further initiatives</p>	<p>Suggestion taken. The national laboratory in Casablanca is accredited to GLP and will undertake the monthly monitoring of soil samples from the contaminated land remediation sites.</p> <p>While various laboratories are indeed active in analysis of pesticide residues, none are equipped for quality control of pesticide products, which typically contain far higher levels of active ingredients which can grossly contaminate residue-testing equipment. This is the reason the project is supporting the upgrade of the LOARC laboratory, to fill an urgent gap both for a certified facility, but also one that can test various parameters in addition to concentration of active ingredient (e.g. impurities and shelf life).</p>

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

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: USD 50 000			
<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. Multi-stakeholder consultations	5 000	3 480	3 428
2. Design of a draft strategy for the disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides stocks; and identification of priority contaminated sites	10 000	12 184	40
3. Preparation of a draft container management strategy	7 000	5 474	0
4. Identification of gaps in existing legislation and capacity building needs for sound pesticide management	5 000	4 432	0
5. Preparation of a draft strategy for the promotion of alternatives to POPs pesticides in CILSS countries	8 000	7 898	0
6. Detailed design of project components based on incremental reasoning, risk analysis, financing plan and institutional and implementation arrangements	10 000	8 314	643
7. Final multi-stakeholder consultations	5 000	2 881	1 108
Total	50 000	44 662	5 219

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

N/A