



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

Project Type: Full-sized Project

Type of Trust Fund: GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Lifecycle Management of Pesticides and Disposal of POPs Pesticides in Central Asian countries and Turkey			
Country	Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkey	GEF Project ID	5000
GEF Agency	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	613306
Other Executing Partner(s)	Ministries of Agriculture, Environment and Health	Submission Date:	01/03/2016
GEF Focal Area(s):	Chemicals – POPs	Resubmission Date:	25/07/2016
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Duration (Months)	48 months
		Agency Fee (\$):	773,014

A. Focal Area Strategy Framework

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
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	8,136,986	38,300,000
Total Project Costs				8,136,986	38,300,000

B. Project Framework

Project Objective: To reduce releases of POPs from obsolete pesticide stockpiles and strengthen capacity for sound pesticide management throughout the life cycle in 4 Central Asian countries and Turkey						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
Component 1: Reduction of releases from POPs and other obsolete pesticides posing high risk to public health and the environment	TA	<p><u>Outcome 1:</u> 900 tonnes of POPs and obsolete pesticides are disposed of in an environmentally sound manner; and risks from obsolete stocks, contaminated sites and empty pesticide containers are further quantified and reduced</p> <p><u>Main indicators:</u></p> <p>a) <i>Technical capacity available for environmentally sound disposal options for POPs and other hazardous wastes in the Central Asian region</i></p> <p>b) <i>900 tonnes of POPs and other obsolete pesticides safeguarded and disposed</i></p> <p>c) <i>% of high risk populations engaging in behaviours that expose them to sources of obsolete pesticides</i></p>	<p>1.1 National Inventory of obsolete pesticides and associated wastes finalized in 3 countries</p> <p>1.2 Risk reduction and disposal strategy for sound management of obsolete and POPs pesticides completed.</p> <p>1.3 900 metric tonnes of obsolete and POPs pesticides are safeguarded and disposed in Azerbaijan and Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.</p> <p>1.4 Risk associated with one critical contaminated site in one country is reduced</p> <p>1.5 Container management capacity developed in the region and risks of empty containers reduced in Azerbaijan</p> <p>1.6 High risk behaviours by exposed populations are quantified and reduced</p>	GEF TF	5,532,958	9,400,000

Component 2: Strengthening the institutional and regulatory framework for pesticide life cycle management	TA	<u>Outcome 2</u> Regulatory and institutional framework for pesticide management strengthened in five countries <u>Main indicators:</u> a) <i>National legislation complies with international standards in Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.</i> b) <i>Data requirements for pesticide registration are more comprehensive</i>	2.1 Revised legal frameworks in line with the International Code of Conduct developed 2.2 Registration procedures and capacity strengthened by training and collection and consideration of field data on pesticide use and impacts 2.3 Field data on typical and best practice techniques for both PPE and spray operations is used to provide advice to farmers (TUR)	GEF TF	713,894	9,100,000
Component 3: Pesticide use and risk reduction through pest monitoring and promotion of alternatives	TA	<u>Outcome 3:</u> Farmers will use IPM alternatives to Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHP), and reduce pesticide application frequencies <u>Main indicators:</u> a) <i>Reduction in pesticide application frequency in four countries</i> b) <i>Pest and disease prevalence data used to inform extension service advice</i> c) <i>Farmers applying IPM methods and familiar with alternative pest control methods</i>	3.1 Pest and disease monitoring to guide plant protection decisions in key crop(s) established 3.2 Integrated pest management practices tested, validated and promoted to male and female farmers 3.3 Quantify and promote the benefits of IPM and alternatives to HHPs, to farmers and pesticide management decision makers	GEF TF	1,054,350	17,750,000
Component 4: Monitoring & Evaluation	TA	<u>Outcome 4</u> Project results are shared between project countries and outside stakeholders <u>Main indicators:</u> a) <i>Number of project monitoring reports as per requirements</i> b) <i>High level commitment from countries to life cycle management</i>	4.1 Project monitoring system fulfils all applicable donor and stakeholder reporting requirements 4.2 Project evidence and lessons are taken into consideration in pesticide and agriculture policy making, and widely disseminated to key national and	GEF TF	449,200	1,050,000

		international audiences.			
			Subtotal	7,750,402	37,300,000
			Project management Cost (PMC)	386,584	1,000,000
			Total project costs	8,136,986	38,300,000

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	Government of Azerbaijan	In-kind	3,000,000
Government	Government of Azerbaijan	Grant	2,000,000
Government	Government of Kazakhstan	In-kind	3,000,000
Government	Government of Kyrgyz Republic	In-kind	1,000,000
Government	Government of Tajikistan	In-kind	1,000,000
Government	Government of Turkey	In-kind	3,300,000
Government	Government of Turkey	Grant	3,000,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	22,000,000
Total Co-financing			38,300,000

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	Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan and Turkey	8,136,986	773,014	8,910,000
Total Grant Resources				8,136,986	773,014	8,910,000

F. Consultants Working for Technical Assistance Components:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants ⁴	1,601,584	3,600,000	5,201,584
National/Local Consultants	436,400	1,700,000	2,136,400

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:

Component 1. The design of Component 1 is largely the same as in the PIF. The only exception is the addition of Output 1.6 addressing high risk behaviours by populations living near obsolete pesticide

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.

and contaminated sites, which include allowing livestock and children to roam on and in such sites, building near or on top of them, and illegally removing products for repackaging and illegal sale. Recognizing the scale and extent of these sites, and the fact that they will likely take decades to fully remove and remediate, the project seeks to describe and document these exposure routes, and develop capacity among local NGOs and public services to develop and deliver behaviour-change driven communication and awareness campaigns in order to reduce risk and exposure by populations. It is hoped that collecting evidence of specific exposure routes will also help generate even more national and international commitment to comprehensive programmes to address these toxic time bombs.

Component 2. This component has been revised and significantly expanded since the PIF, which initially planned for *"an analysis of pesticide management throughout their life cycle to identify weaknesses and capacity building needs for inspection and quality control...(and) preparation of a clear capacity building plan..."*. Both these activities have been completed by co-financing and baseline project supported by the EC, which provided Status Reports and Concept Notes for pesticide life cycle management in each country. The project has therefore reallocated the Component 2 budget to demonstration pilots in each country which will implement prioritized field activities at different stages of the pesticide lifecycle, in response to country requests for concrete field activities. The original Component 2 has been split into two components, with the new Component 2 focusing on legislative and regulatory review, working with government regulators, and the new Component 3 targeting farmers with training and improved pesticide handling practices. The reviewed activities are anticipated to bring a significant increase in impact compared to the original activities, within the original budget limits.

Component 3. The proposed Component 3 has been added since the PIF in recognition of the different target group, namely farmers and pesticide users, as described above under Component 2.

Component 4. The component for M&E in the PIF did not contain any funds for essential M&E functions including annual Project Steering Committees. These have been added in, along with other cross cutting M&E tasks, to the component budgets.

- 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 900 tonnes of existing obsolete pesticides and remediate one heavily contaminated priority sites. To prevent future mismanagement, focus will also be on strengthening institutional capacity to improve and enforce pesticide regulations, and on promoting alternatives to highly hazardous pesticides (HHP) to users and governments.

- 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

Description of risk	Ranking	Mitigation measures	Responsibility
Project agreement with FAO will not be signed in different countries in a timely manner and season-sensitive activities such as inventory field work and cropping systems are unavoidably delayed to Year 2	High	The project development process has been marked by strong cooperation and coordination between national and international project partners building on past projects, and participatory planning of the project including two workshops (Inception, Ankara, Feb and validation, Antalya, Oct 2014). The project will set a strict deadline for countries and FAO to establish necessary project agreements to allow for an inception meeting in Spring 2015. Component 3 activities have been largely planned for Year 2, and Flexibility in final selection of crops and organisation of field work will allow the project to respond to any unavoidable delays (e.g. selection of winter crops for IPM)	FAO SEC
Lack of disposal options in the Central Asian Region means that safeguarded stocks will not be able to be finally disposed	High	The project plans to dispose of stockpiles from Azerbaijan which is the only country able to export stocks in the usual manner. To mitigate this risk for future projects, feasibility studies for alternative destruction options will be conducted, and ongoing discussions on the export ban continued. The project will delay field safeguarding and repackaging until the disposal strategy is complete in order to only repackage wastes with a viable disposal route.	CTA
Political instability in project countries.	Medium	There is no current unrest in project countries, although this may be affected by developments in the wider region. These will be closely monitored through regular field visits and events and communication with National Component Team Leaders.	FAO
Contradiction between national and international legislation/ standards; and between ministries	Medium	Previous work has involved all stakeholders in assessing legal frameworks and a validation workshop will be held early to ensure that national legal stakeholders recognise and support the suggested changes to bring international and national legislation to agree. The implementation and institutional agreements have been discussed with government representatives and endorsed at the validation workshop to ensure consensus on responsibilities.	Legal consultant
Lack of technical capacity (personnel and equipment) in project countries, including staff mobility	High	The project will encourage commitment through provision of high quality training and capacity building opportunities. The National Coordinators in each country structure will be instrumental in communicating to Ministries the need for trained staff to remain in existing posts for the duration of the project.	CTA
Objections and non-cooperation with disposal activities by governments and civil society in project and transit countries.	High	The project will only use disposal facilities that meet Basel ESM requirements, and the feasibility studies of alternative technologies will include a social and political assessment and engagement of affected stakeholders including civil society, local populations, and others. Transboundary movements of wastes will be in line with the Basel Convention	CTA and FAO

Insufficient funds for safeguarding of major contaminated sites, the disposal of POPs and other project activities	High	The project will focus on filling gaps and uncertainties associated with the inventory, in order to target the highest priority sites for safeguarding. The project will also dedicate regional communications and visibility resources to managing expectations and be very clear of its role as part of a suite of projects that will be needed to fully address the problem in the region.	PSC, FAO
Accidents and exposure during safeguarding, transport and handling of wastes and empty containers.	Low to medium	Training in safety, monitoring and handling procedures will be provided to all national staff. Personal Protection Equipment (PPE) provided for all personnel involved in safeguarding.	FAO
Lack of awareness about OP problems among populations and decision makers	Medium	The project will highlight both the risks and the solutions for obsolete pesticides through field activities with integrated public and political awareness raising, and through high level meetings and workshops with international and regional participation	NGOS
Climate risks such as heavy winters and hot summers, crop calendars disruption or increase of pest invasions	Medium	Emergency sites will be safeguarded during the spring and autumn to avoid the extreme heat and cold. Contingency plans, especially relating to PPE wearability in hot conditions, will be included in the EMP.	FAO, CTA
Low existing use and uptake of alternative technologies by producers.	Medium	The promotion of IPM through FFS is relatively new in the region, so the project has selected to continue an ongoing project in Kyrgyz Republic. Local NGOs and research institutes will be involved to ensure local relevance and increase the adoption rates.	IPM specialists

A.7 Coordination with other GEF financed initiatives

The project is closely coordinated with a regional project "FAO EC Improving capacities to eliminate and prevent recurrence of obsolete pesticides as a model for tackling unused hazardous chemicals in the former Soviet Union, 2012-2016 (GCP/RER/040/EC)" which has completed preparatory activities in inventory of obsolete stocks and needs assessment for pesticide life cycle management. The institutional arrangements for the two projects are identical to allow for synergies to be exploited and efficiency savings to be made.

The project is closely aligned with the project "Demonstrating and Scaling Up Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for the Control of Vector Borne Diseases in Southern Caucasus and Central Asia", 2011-2015 (GEF ID 3614) implemented by UNEP. This project aims to facilitate the Environmental Impact Assessment of the construction of a central pesticide store in the Kyrgyz Republic. The FAO EC project will finance its construction. This store will be used by the GEF project as a central collection centre for safeguarded stocks prior to disposal. The project will closely liaise with the project "POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project" in Turkey implemented by UNDP and Executed by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization (MoEU) (GEF project id 4601. This project aims to qualify the Izaydas incineration facility for destroying POPs pesticides.

The project has been designed to complement GEF project "POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project" in Turkey, by focusing obsolete pesticides removal in the other countries, but with regular exchange visits and regional experience sharing between all countries to enable Turkey's experience in the UNDP/UNIDO project to be effectively shared with other countries.

The project will use the "Rapid Environmental Assessment" tools that were first developed in the GEF POPs project in Vietnam and subsequently enhanced in the GEF projects in Botswana, Mozambique and Malawi.

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 4.1 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 include representatives from all Governments and FAO. The committee will meet annually or more frequent as necessary. The PSC will be supported by the Project Technical Committee (PTC) which will be responsible for the day to day management of the project.

These civil society and other technical partners will be members of a Project Technical Committee, which will coordinate activities between partners and between Components, and make recommendations for the Project Steering Committee to adopt.

At local community/farmer level the project will work with national and local NGOs in order to provide a number of community and pesticide user surveys, as well as deliver communication strategies and workplans.

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.

Due to migration of men as laborers to Russia and Ukraine, women constitute an important proportion 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 residues. The project will explicitly target women, children and seasonal workers through the pesticide surveillance pilot in component 3, and ensure that women are represented in all project component activities through partnerships with civil society organizations in training and awareness-raising activities. By improving the pesticide registration, labelling and packaging systems, the project will improve risk communication to all pesticide users and vulnerable groups will be explicitly considered in the training and activities on registration.

This project will promote alternative and more effective pesticide application techniques, and document and report on the financial and economic sustainability of farmers. To reduce demand for POPs and highly hazardous pesticides, the project will research, pilot and promote viable alternatives for key crops, in an effort to drive long-term uptake of such non-toxic alternatives. Agricultural production carried out in compliance with IPM approach contributes to high quality crops that are highly competitive within the international marketplace.

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 in regional destruction facilities such as appropriately upgraded and monitored cement kilns. The institutional arrangements are identical to the FAO-EC

project and synergies will be explored to improve cost effective project execution as well as closely integrating the project workplans.

FAO is the implementing and executing agency for other GEF-funded POPs projects in Africa. Through the FAO Lead Technical Unit and Project Task Forces, these will be closely coordinated and opportunities to exploit synergies such as developing guidelines and training materials will be exploited.

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 385,200 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 Green Cross Switzerland (GCCH) and the CTA, and driven by the preparation and implementation of annual work plans and budgets (AWP/B) and six-monthly project progress reports (PPRs) by the CTA. 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 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 Team 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.

Component 4 on M&E allows for the development and coordination of a results based monitoring system that will additionally report on the indicators and impact of the project based on the results framework. This work will be coordinated by GCCH and data provided from the National Project Consultants and National Project Management Teams from all relevant ministries.

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 pesticide and pest management surveillance pilot projects in Components 2 and 3 will also be an important source of information for the M&E system. Data collected from the pilots 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

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 National Project Coordinator will prepare a project inception report in consultation with the 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 Benin), 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 Chief Technical Advisor 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, the National 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 co-financing 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 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 Benin 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	CTA, Project Technical Committee, Project Steering Committee, FAO (FAO SEC 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 50,000 workshop +
Inception report	CTA 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 5,000
Design and implementation of M&E system	GCCH with support from FAO LTO and LTU.	Within the first six months after the project inception	USD 3,000
Impact monitoring updates	GCCH with input from National Component Team Leaders	Monthly	USD 46,200 GCCH and USD 6,000 CTL

Type of monitoring and evaluation activity	Responsible parties	Time frame	Budget
Supervision missions	FAO LTO/LTU	Annual or as required.	Paid by GEF Agency fee
Support missions	GCCH	Once to each project country & participation in PSC	USD 42,000
Project progress reports (PPRs)	CTA. Cleared by BH and the LTO with comments from the GEF Unit, when requested. Finalized reports submitted to the FAO GEF Unit by the BH/CTA for upload on FPMIS	Six- monthly	USD 15,000
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	FAO LTO with inputs from the CTA, 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	CTA with information from all co-financing partners and National Component Team Leaders	Six monthly and annually as part of PPR and PIR.	USD 7,500
PSC meetings (Year 4 one is also the Terminal Workshop)	CTA, PSC Chair, FAO Budget Holder	At least once a year	USD 65,000 plus component budgets
Technical reports	CTA, Consultants, FAO LTO/LTU	As appropriate	From fee and component budgets
Mid- term evaluation	External consultant, Organized by FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 70,000. FAO staff time paid through the GEF agency fee.
Final evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent evaluation unit in consultation with the project team and other partners	At the end of project implementation	USD 70,000. FAO staff time paid through the GEF agency fee
Terminal report	CTA, FAO LTO	At least one month before end of project	USD 5,500
			USD 385,200

PROVISION FOR EVALUATIONS

A Mid-Term review (MTR) 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 review 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 MTR in consultation with the project partners. The review will, *inter alia*:

- (i) review the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation;
- (ii) analyse 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)
Hussein Baghirov	Minister	MINISTRY OF ECOLOGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES AZERBAIJAN	01/04/2011
Turmagambetov Majit	Vice Minister	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT KAZAKHSTAN	04/01/2011
Biymyrza Toktoraliev	Director	STATE AGENCY ON ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTRY OF KYRGYZ REPUBLIC	04/01/2011
Talbak Salimov	Chairman of the Committee	COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION TAJIKISTAN	04/01/2011
Lutfi Akca	Undersecretary	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND FORESTRY TURKEY	04/01/2011

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 and Programme Management FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy		25 July 2016	Richard Thompson	+3906 5705 2725	Richard.Thompson@fao.org
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator FAO GEF Coordination Unit Investment Centre Division FAO				+3906 57055680	GEF- Coordination- Unit@fao.org

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 52. A detailed results budget is presented in Appendix 3 on page 67.

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
a) The PIF indicates there are illegal trade problems in the region, but there is no proposal to include Customs capacity building in the project framework within the context of strengthening regulation of pesticides.	The pesticide lifecycle reviews undertaken in the project preparation identified the critical capacity building activities to be undertaken in each country. It was recommended that pesticide legislation on registration and labeling should be the primary focus as it is the fundamental basis for identifying illegal pesticides. This activity will be undertaken in the pilot in Tajikistan in component 2.
b) There should be care to synergise with the UNDP/UNIDO project for Turkey submitted in this current work programme entitled "POPs Legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project" (Project ID 4601). This project also seeks to tackle sound disposal of pesticides, and so there should be care to ensure there is no duplication of effort.	Turkey is not included in the disposal component so there is no duplication of effort. At the time of selecting disposal options at the end of year 2, the developments in disposal capacity in Turkey will be considered along with the other options
c) The opportunity should be used to develop plans, options, and budgets for the sound destruction of the remaining disposed stockpiles, based on the experience of the this project	At the completion of the disposal activities and the pilot for risk reduction at the highly contaminated sites, a report will be prepared that makes recommendations for a disposal strategy for the remaining obsolete pesticides, burial sites and contaminated soils together with outline costs. This report can be the basis for further resource mobilization and the development of a concerted programme that addresses all the needs of the region.
d) The project intends to develop a series of site specific environmental management plans (EMPs) for heavily contaminated sites which pose an immediate risk to public health and the environment. Thereafter it is proposed that the EMP generated will be used to remediate sites by application of local technologies in Azerbaijan as a demonstration project, which can be used as a model for replication in other countries. But what are the local technologies? And in the absence of full contaminant characterization at as-of-yet-unidentified high risk sites which will likely have multiple contaminant species,	FAO has developed a methodology for site assessment and risk reduction that aims to ensure that the risks from contaminated sites in a country are reduced to the maximum extent possible in the shortest time within the constraints of a defined budget. The process is based on best practice from other contaminated site assessment methodologies (including Canadian National Classification System for Contaminated Sites; Blacksmith Institute TSIP "Toxic Site Identification Programme"). This methodology starts with a low cost "Rapid Environmental Assessment" (REA) that evaluates the risks in the source-pathway-receptor dynamic. The REA quickly identifies potentially high risk sites for further investigation. The prioritized sites have a preliminary site

how can one know that these technologies will be appropriate?

investigation including limited sampling to develop a conceptual site model and further refine the risks and to further prioritize and select the sites for detailed intrusive site investigation and sampling. From these investigations environmental management plans for each site are developed including site risk reduction strategies. The risk reduction strategies are based on the US EPA standards and aim to break the source-pathway-receptor in the most effective way.

This methodology has been developed from FAO's experience in Mozambique, Botswana, Malawi, Kenya and Vietnam. It is now being formalised into a guideline document under FAO's Environmental Management Tool Kit series as volume 5.

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

PPG GRANT APPROVED AT PIF: USD 200 000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Activity 1: Organize regional inception workshop and conduct regional and national level stakeholder analyses	37,000	76,738	0
Activity 2: Management of obsolete pesticides	45,000	31,772	0
Activity 3: Pesticide risk reduction and life-cycle management	40,000	31,772	0
Activity 4: Monitoring and Evaluation	40,000	31,772	0
Activity 5: Information synthesis, project design and budgeting	38,000	20,608	0
8. Translation			
Total	200,000	192,663	0
Remaining balance*:		7,337	

*The remaining balance will be committed to the translations of the project document

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

N/A

⁶ Some of the PPG activities, such as design of pesticide life cycle assessment, were funded by the EC-funded project.