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Executive summary

ES1. The EC-funded Programme entitled “Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA) in ACP countries” has the overall objective to strengthen capacity in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries to implement, comply with and enforce Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). The UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) is responsible for the implementation of the subcomponent “The clean-up of obsolete pesticides, pesticides management and sustainable pest management”.

ES2. The FAO managed subcomponent, (“the project”), is designed to help ACP countries to identify and move towards elimination of their obsolete pesticide stocks while building capacity to manage pesticides throughout their life cycle more effectively and thereby prevent future accumulation.

ES3. The mid-term evaluation found that generally the project is doing a good job at addressing the needs identified by ACP countries despite some difficulties in implementing the planned activities in some countries within the agreed timeframe due to lack of funds and the limited capacity to take action in the countries.

ES4. During the first year of implementation, cross-cutting areas and regional priorities were identified through a consultative process, which engaged the main stakeholders in each region.

ES5. With respect to the cross-cutting areas, capacity has been built in several countries in Africa and the Caribbean to use the Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS) to collect and share information on pesticide stocks in a standardized format. In the Pacific, the use of PSMS has not yet been deployed but will be introduced before the end of 2011. A postgraduate distance-learning course on pesticide risk management for regulators was launched at the University of Cape Town (South Africa) and regulators from the three regions are attending the first course. Technical guidelines related to pesticide life-cycle management and pesticide registration were developed and a guidance note related to soil remediation based on the very successful experience carried out in Mali was elaborated. Several workshops/events have been organized to foster consultation, collaboration and coordination within the 3 regions.

ES6. At regional level, the inventory of obsolete pesticides (output 1) has been completed in some countries (Malawi, Kenya, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines). In the remaining project countries it is either on-going (Swaziland, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, 10 Caribbean countries) or planned for 2011 (Botswana, Trinidad & Tobago). It is anticipated that all national inventories will be completed by December 2011.

ES7. Safeguarding of stocks (output 2) has been completed in St Lucia and is in progress in some countries where inventory activities have been completed (Kenya and Malawi, or planned for the end of 2011 (Swaziland and Suriname). Similarly, disposal of stocks (output 3) is foreseen to take place at the end of 2011 in the above-mentioned countries. The assessment of contaminated sites was completed in Fiji, Samoa and Tonga.

ES8. In terms of capacity building in pesticide management (output 4), the enforcement of a common registration system and its harmonization with other pesticides registration
regulations in the respective regions has been agreed by the concerned authorities in CILSS countries and in the five target countries in the Pacific. Key activities to design the regional systems have begun. In the Caribbean region, the pesticide legislation and registration has been analysed by an international expert and on the basis of his findings, countries will decide on their preferred way towards regionally harmonized pesticide registration during the next workshop on Pesticides Registration and the Rotterdam Convention planned in November 2011 in St. Lucia.

ES9. The development of communications and awareness strategies on the importance and dangers of obsolete stockpiles, highly hazardous pesticide formulations and pesticide hazards and alternatives has begun in Africa with the support of PAN-Africa, in the Pacific with the involvement of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, and is planned in the Caribbean with the collaboration of the University of the West Indies. Promotion of alternatives to chemical pesticides, through farmers’ capacity building on IPM will start soon in the Pacific and in Africa.

ES10. FAO provides support to assist countries to access additional funds.

Recommendations

ES11. Given the satisfactory results achieved by the project despite the limited resources available, the mid-term evaluation strongly recommends continued support of the project in order to achieve all the planned activities, as well as the initiation of a second phase of the project to allow extension of the strategies developed to new countries and to meet the growing demand for assistance in eliminating obsolete pesticide stocks or in addressing other aspects of pesticide management. Furthermore, the mid-term evaluation makes the following specific recommendations:

Box 1. For Africa region

- Develop a specific logframe for Africa region providing clarity on the activities within the scope of the ACP MEA funds, and those outside the scope.
- Accelerate the implementation of ASP phase 2 to anticipate resolving the problem of increasing quantities of obsolete pesticides in African countries.
- Develop a contingency plan for major pest control at national and regional levels to ensure coordination between different actors and to avoid any accumulation of pesticides notably in locust control.
- Strengthen the CNGP capacities of the CILSS countries on pesticide management by training its staff notably on the use of PSMS.
- Hasten the signing of LoAs between FAO/ASP Mali, to deploy the PSMS to all CILSS countries, and between FAO/INSAH to carry out the following studies: a) preliminary assessment of the functioning of the common registration system in the CILSS countries, b) study of pesticide market and the impact on food security, c) assessment of post-registration activities and d) socioeconomic assessment of pesticide use.
Box 2. For Caribbean region

- CARICOM through the Council for Trade and Economic Development (COTED) formally engage Coordinating Group for Pesticide Control Boards of the Caribbean (CGPC), with support from CAHFSA, to establish the regional stakeholder platform that is required for participatory ownership and action geared towards the efficient implementation of the project in the Caribbean region.
- For sustainability of this intervention beyond the life of the project, due attention must be paid to updating the legislative, policy and institutional/social frameworks for sound pesticides management and pest reduction at both the national and regional levels.
- It seems opportune to consolidate the operationalization of the project in the region by strengthening the capacity and capability of the CAHFSA to mobilize for the acquisition of the required funding. This revised approach should be communicated to stakeholders attending the proposed regional training workshop on Pesticides Registration and the Rotterdam Convention in November 2011 in St. Lucia.

Box 3. For Pacific region

- The institutionalization of the PSMS at SPC. Work on this is yet to begin. Training of SPC staff in the PSMS should be undertaken as a matter of urgency.
- Primary data collection through sampling of contaminated soil, and risk quantification through rapid environmental assessment of sites in Samoa, Tonga and Niue should be undertaken as soon as possible, site prioritized and remediation plans developed. It is recommended that FAO provide training to Secretariat of the Pacific Environment Programme (SPREP) staff, and that SPREP conduct the sampling program, with FAO completing the data analysis and risk profiling in consultation with SPREP.
- Feasibility study of container recycling for Samoa should be completed as an immediate priority. Comparative review of container management needs in additional four countries should also be initiated. Consultants for container activities should consult closely with SPREP, as well as FAO.
- Communications and awareness activities should be fully integrated into technical activities being undertaken in Components 1-4. This will require consultation with SPREP on key messages to be relayed, and key stakeholders, under Components 2 and 3.
- In order to encourage collaboration between the SPREP and SPC managed sections of the project FAO should consider establishing a project management group, including key personnel at SPREP and SPC, and update them monthly on project activities via email.

Overall recommendations

- Further intensify efforts to find additional funds to complete all planned activities.
- FAO staff is encouraged to continue to work through internal channels to ensure the TCPs presented are approved for funding in this biennium, thereby ensuring that they can be executed quickly.
- Encourage the use of national and regional expertise gained in the previous projects to assist, at lower cost, the new countries in the implementation of their project particularly for training, inventory, safeguarding activities and soil decontamination.
- Intensify the implementation of communication activities and visibility, focusing on the outputs and impact of the project targeting general and specific audience particularly at country level.
1 Introduction

1. The EC-funded Programme entitled “Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA) in ACP countries” has the overall objective to strengthen capacity in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries to implement, comply with and enforce Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). The UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) is responsible for the implementation of the subcomponent “The clean-up of obsolete pesticides, pesticides management and sustainable pest management.” with an EC contribution of EUR 4 448 220 to an overall gross budget of EUR 4.9M including the FAO contribution.

2. The objectives of this subcomponent project are:
   • to assist the ACP countries in eliminating existing obsolete pesticide stocks;
   • to explore opportunities for reduction of reliance on synthetic chemical pesticides while improving the management of pests and pesticides in ACP countries; and
   • to prevent the creation of obsolete pesticides and reduce the adverse impacts of pesticides on health and the environment in the future.

3. The project was launched in April 2009 and will end in March 2013. It is operational in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific regions in the following countries:
   • Africa: Benin, Botswana, Cameroon, Kenya, Burkina Faso, Chad, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Malawi, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal and Swaziland;
   • Caribbean: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad & Tobago; and
   • Pacific: Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Tonga.

4. The project is coordinated by the staff of the Pesticides Risk Reduction group of the Plant Production and Protection Division (AGPM) located at FAO headquarters. In Africa it is implemented by the government focal points through FAO offices and the ASP structure in place. In the Caribbean and Pacific regions project implementation is coordinated through the FAO sub-regional offices, in collaboration with regional organizations: the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) in the Pacific and the Coordinating Group for Pesticide Control Boards of the Caribbean (CGPC) in default of CARICOM in the Caribbean.

5. This mid-term evaluation is conducted by 3 international consultants in project evaluation, with experience in pesticide management issues for Africa (Mr Said Ghaout), Caribbean (Ms Rufina Paul) and Pacific (Ms Melanie Ashton). They visited separately representative samples of countries in the 3 regions:
   • for Africa region, Mr Said Ghaout visited Benin, Mali and Burkina Faso from 13 to 28 August 2011;
   • for Caribbean region, Ms Rufina Paul visited Barbados and Jamaica from 11 to 18 September 2011; and
   • for Pacific region, Ms Melanie Ashton visited Fiji and Samoa from 27 July to 4 August 2011.
6. The purpose and the scope of the mid-term evaluation are presented in the terms of reference attached as Annex 1. The persons met by the mission are listed in Annex 2 and the documents available to the mission are provided in Annex 3.

2 Background and context

7. The MEAs address environmental issues of global concern by obligating the respective parties to undertake joint and individual actions to achieve their objectives in such areas as climate change, biological diversity, desertification, ozone layer protection, hazardous chemicals and hazardous wastes, trade in endangered species of wild fauna and flora, conservation of migratory species of wild animals, and coastal and marine environment.

8. The MEAs, while addressing their global objectives, help developing countries to protect themselves from adverse impacts of such global environmental problems. On the other hand, due to the interdependent and transboundary nature of those problems, all parties, both developing and developed, need to comply with the requirements set out in the respective MEAs. This is a challenging task for developing countries that often lack necessary resources, skills and expertise to develop and strengthen adequate legislation and institutions and to take administrative and other actions to implement the obligations under MEAs.

9. In the above context, the EC-funded programme “Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA) in ACP countries” is to provide support to ACP countries in strengthening their capacities to implement, comply with and enforce the MEAs to which they are parties, as well as to enhance their capacity to participate in negotiations under those MEAs.

10. Under component 2 of the MEA programme, the FAO-managed subcomponent is intended to assist ACP countries in identifying and moving towards elimination of obsolete pesticide stocks, while building capacity to manage pesticides throughout their lifecycle more effectively, thereby preventing further accumulation.

11. The problems caused by pesticide mismanagement persist with powerful impacts on developing countries. The infrastructure controlling and managing pesticides throughout their life-cycle is often weak and under-resourced, and the end users of pesticides are usually untrained and poorly equipped to use them safely. These countries and their farmers often choose to use highly toxic pesticides because they are cheaper than less hazardous products. Import and regulatory controls are weak in many developing countries and hence poor quality and illegal pesticides often enter local markets with little or no control.

12. Mismanagement has also led to the gradual creation of problems that appear to be unsolvable such as the accumulation of vast quantities of pesticides that have become unusable over the years, and contamination from pesticides that cannot be removed from the environment.

13. There are differences between the ACP regions in terms of problems related to pesticide management and stockpile accumulation:
14. In Africa, the ongoing African Stockpiles Programme (ASP) launched in September 2005 aims to completely remove all obsolete pesticides, including POPs, from all African countries in a phased programme lasting 15 years as well as develop effective systems to prevent future accumulation through institutional and technical capacity building and education. ASP-P1 is the first group of projects targeting seven countries (Ethiopia, Mali, Morocco, South Africa, Tanzania, Tunisia and Nigeria), and it constitutes the first phase of the ASP. The implementation of ASP phase 2 with other countries is in preparation. The EC-funded MEA project will provide an important contribution to these efforts.

15. In the Caribbean, stockpiles of obsolete pesticides are considered a problem that needs to be addressed, and some work has started towards that end. Jamaica carried out a self-financed disposal of obsolete pesticides and other countries have completed inventories in the framework of Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plans (NIPs). Suriname has also done some safeguarding of obsolete pesticides as part of its NIP. The logistics of obsolete pesticide disposal from the Caribbean countries is complex because small amounts are held in several islands. Collection within the region will need to be organized, followed by export for destruction outside the region. This will be logistically and technically complex, and expensive. Nevertheless, most countries highlight obsolete pesticide disposal as a need, and solutions therefore need to be found. Therefore, the needs in the Caribbean region are primarily focused on the elimination of obsolete stocks of pesticides.

16. In the Pacific, the POPs in PICs (Pacific Island Countries) project funded through AusAID has been successful in disposing of approximately 140 tonnes of POPs (including some PCB wastes) and general pesticide waste. The project was completed (excluding PNG) in 2008. The needs in the Pacific are therefore more focused on issues related to improved pesticide management and control of use to protect public health and the environment rather than the safeguarding and disposal of current stockpiles of obsolete pesticides and associated wastes.

17. During the inception phase of the EC project, consultation meetings were organized with the major stakeholders and partners in the three different geographical regions on the project, to assess needs, to determine priority areas for work and to develop a workplan and budget for each region and for the international cross-cutting activities.

18. The priorities by region, as well as cross-cutting activities, are summarized in the table below:

Table 1. Regional priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Regional priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>• Inventory;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Safeguarding of stocks in countries where inventory activities have been supported by ASP so far (Benin, Cameroon, Kenya, Malawi and Swaziland);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disposal (Kenya, Malawi and Swaziland);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Harmonization of pesticides registration regulations (in collaboration with CILSS, in the West Africa region); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Communications and awareness of the importance and dangers of obsolete stockpiles and highly hazardous pesticide formulations and promotion of alternatives to chemical pesticides.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Caribbean | • Training on inventories;  
| | • Complete national inventories of obsolete pesticides;  
| | • Development of a plan for elimination of existing stockpiles of obsolete pesticides;  
| | • Pesticide use and misuse requires awareness raising in the region;  
| | • Monitoring of pesticide residues is a recurring issue in the region;  
| | • Capacity building support;  
| | • Pesticides legislation. In the past draft harmonized legislation was prepared. Updated information will be provided by countries to assess specific needs to move legislation issues forward;  
| | • Post-registration issues. The project should support information sharing with regard to post-registration; and  
| | • Harmonized registration meets some inherent difficulties. The project is to facilitate this issue by providing expertise to review the various registration systems in all countries; to review the issue of implementing a harmonized registration procedure; and to train pesticide registrars in reviewing data for the registration process.  
| Pacific | • Communications and awareness raising on pesticides related risks;  
| | • Enforcement of regulations already in place in the Pacific, and efforts towards a regional harmonization of regulations;  
| | • Assessments of sites that have been contaminated in the past;  
| | • Management of pesticide containers;  
| | • Promotion of alternatives and organic agriculture.;  
| | • Removal of small quantities of residual stocks; and  
| | • Community based health monitoring.  
| Cross-cutting issues | • The development and spread of the Pesticide Stock Management System as a regional cross-cutting activity (Africa, Caribbean, Pacific);  
| | • Training – the development and implementation of a Masters degree course for pesticide registrars by the University of Cape Town, with technical support of FAO, and the project providing scholarships for participants – a regional cross-cutting activity (Africa with interest in short courses in Pacific);  
| | • Development of guidelines in key areas related to pesticide life-cycle management;  
| | • Development of communications tools and awareness creation materials;  
| | • Provision of a forum for information exchange and coordination of activities across all regions.  

19. It is worth mentioning that FAO has developed a comprehensive set of technical guidelines, training modules and management systems to assist countries in project implementation. In this regard, country-based activities in respect of the regional undertaking are being implemented in a staged approach involving:

**Stage 1:** A detailed situation analysis (including inventory, environmental risk assessment, emergency safeguarding and review of pesticide management capacity through legislation/IPM/life-cycle management); and

**Stage 2:** An implementation phase where risk reduction through disposal is completed alongside institutional strengthening to prevent future accumulation.
3 Assesement of project objectives and design

3.1 Development objective and justification for the project

20. The overall objective is to strengthen capacity in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries to implement, comply with and enforce Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).

21. The overall outcome is capacity building of the ACP countries to effectively manage pesticides in accordance with the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides, the Rotterdam, Stockholm, Basel and ILO Safety and Health in Agriculture Conventions.

22. The immediate objectives are to assist the ACP countries in: i) eliminating existing obsolete pesticide stocks; ii) exploring opportunities for reduction of reliance on synthetic chemical pesticides in agriculture; and iii) preventing the creation of obsolete pesticides.

23. The project has four major outputs to be achieved in each participating country:
   - Obsolete and usable pesticides inventory and risk assessment available;
   - Obsolete pesticides safely repackaged;
   - Obsolete pesticide stockpiles safely disposed of in up to 10 countries; and
   - Pesticide management, policies and strategies put in place.

24. Many ACP countries have obsolete pesticides, but the problem has not generally been identified in country development strategies. These countries have agrarian activities and agriculture is the mainstay of their economies. Intensive agricultural production and economic pressures have required large pesticide inputs. It is the case for industrial crops as cotton and also for the control of migratory pests, which are using enormous volumes of pesticides. Therefore, these countries import a huge quantity of pesticides annually but they do not have the required infrastructure, adequate facilities or technical skills to assure storage of these pesticides in a safe and environmentally sound manner. Consequently, the pesticide containers deteriorate rapidly, start to leak and their contents contaminate large areas of soil, and underground water causing serious human health and environmental risks.

25. Obsolete chemical pesticides may also be held within the community, albeit in smaller quantities. Farmers are usually not aware of expiry dates of pesticides, or do not check expiry dates when buying pesticides. They usually have small amounts of pesticides left over at the end of a season, which they keep and use in the following season. This means that many farmers have obsolete pesticides, which they continue to use and store. Expired products may be ineffective, leading to overuse, or degrade into unknown products and expose users and final consumers via residues.

26. Given the above, the mid-term evaluation deems that the project addresses a very important issue related to pesticide management system and the needs of the ACP countries since the problem of pesticides is a serious threat to public health, mainly for the most vulnerable population and also to the environment. The project has the potential to make a significant contribution to prevent accumulation of pesticides stocks, to reduce the risk of
accumulating obsolete stocks of pesticides and of adverse impacts on human health and the environment.

3.2 Project design

27. The project has major synergies with a number of other initiatives such as the Africa Stockpiles Programme (ASP), Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal action on hazardous waste management, WHO, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) projects on improved disease vector control.

28. The ASP is currently considered the major programme dealing with pesticide management and obsolete pesticides, which is operational in Africa. As previously described, the ASP Programme started in 2005 and aims to dispose of the vast majority of obsolete pesticides in Africa plus develop effective systems to prevent future accumulation through institutional capacity building and education. Operations have progressed at a different pace in season each of the countries of Phase 1. The EC-funded MEA project can be considered as strengthening the second phase of the ASP as it provides an important contribution to the success of the programme.

29. By improving pesticide management people who are working with pesticides are less likely to be exposed to their short- and long-term toxic effects, consumers will benefit from food that contains no harmful pesticide residues and the general population will benefit from an environment less contaminated by pesticides.

30. The safeguarding and elimination of obsolete pesticides will remove particularly serious risks of old and deteriorated pesticides that are frequently leaking into the environment and hence contaminating food, water, land and animals as well as people who are directly exposed to the chemicals. The immediate beneficiaries will be the communities living and working close to obsolete pesticide storage points and the wider community that is currently indirectly exposed to contamination through food, water and sometimes air.

31. The mid-term evaluation deems that the project design is in general satisfactory, and addresses adequately the priorities set by countries, but considers it very ambitious given the number of concerned countries, scope of work to be completed and the limits of the available resources.

32. According to FAO, the ACP-MEA funds were viewed as seed money to begin work, and FAO have been working consistently to raise additional funds through the TCP Facility and partnership activities, in order to achieve all activities included in the log-frames.

33. It should be noted that FAO reviewed the logframes for the Pacific region in parallel with the mid-term review, providing clarity on the activities within the scope of the ACP MEA funds, and those outside the scope. These revised logframes are included in Annex 4 to this report. The log-frames for the Caribbean Region are also in Annex 5.
**4 Assessment of project implementation, efficiency and management**

4.1 **Project budget and expenditure**

34. The EC allocated to FAO, through the project GCP/INT/063/EC, an amount of EUR 4,448,220. The budget holder of the project is ensured by PCU of the Obsolete Pesticides Programme of the Plant Protection Service in FAO Rome.

35. As a result of the regional consultations, the budget allocations for the different regions and for cross-cutting activities were as follows:

- African region – € 2,237,959
  - East African subregion [Kenya, Malawi]: €552,120;
  - Central African subregion [Cameroon]: €175,480;
  - South African subregion [Botswana, Swaziland]: €1,034,744; and
  - West African subregion [Benin, CILSS, PAN]: €475,615).
- Caribbean region – €759,915
- Pacific region – €797,150
- Cross-cutting issues – €571,915

36. Total expenditure as at 30 August 2011 and reported by FAO is €1,930,941 (43% of the total budget allocation) (details on the table in Annex 6). The expenses incurred by the project were mainly used for staff salaries (48%), International travel project staff and travel of national participants for regional workshops (21%), consultants (16%) and general operating expenses (6%).

37. The budget allocation was very limited so leveraging activities was deemed necessary due to the broad scope of priorities defined by ACP countries, and the associated costs. In this case, such an approach is considered vital to the effectiveness of project execution. FAO has been working to raise additional funds through the TCP Facility and partnership activities in order to achieve all activities included in the logframe.

38. Indeed, in terms of fund raising, FAO/PCU has been very active to obtain GEF co-funding for a second phase of the ASP to allow expansion of the programme into other countries. It has assisted the countries in drafting project proposals and has provided support to assist countries to find bilateral donors.

39. The FAO/PCU with the government’s official representatives met with several potential donors in different countries and sub-regions to enable effective response to requests for assistance from the countries. The countries visited by the mission recognize and appreciate the efforts made by FAO using successfully the EC project resources to leverage additional funds. For instance, as a result of these efforts, Japan has agreed to an amount of US$2.5 million as a contribution to safeguard and remove obsolete pesticides in Benin in Africa. In the Pacific, project resources are currently being used to leverage an additional US$2.5 million from the FAO TCP, and Components 2 and 3 have been used to leverage an additional US$500,000, from the UNEP implemented GEF-PAS project.
4.2 Activities and outputs

40. The following sections describe the activities and outputs of the project regarding cross-cutting issues (1) and regional priorities (2) and the assessment of these by the mid-term evaluation.

4.2.1 Cross cutting issues

1) Pesticide stock management system (PSMS) development

41. The PSMS is web-based pesticide life cycle management software developed to: i) include a comprehensive inventory of useable and obsolete stocks; ii) identify their registration status, and iii) monitor their quality control and their further movement in the country and use up to the disposal of old and new obsolete stocks and empty containers. The PSMS allows monitoring the pesticide life cycle of each drum/container from reception in the country up to its recycling through a system of bar code. The system offers an effective tool for the management of the pesticide life cycle, which can be widely applied in a wide range of country settings. The system is operational in all of ASP phase 1 countries and was extended to others. The EC project aims to build capacity in the ACP countries to use PSMS by training national staff and by adapting the system to meet country needs.

42. The project allowed training the national teams of many ACP countries on PSMS.

43. In Africa, a training session on PSMS was organized in Cameroon in June 2010 for a national team (10 people) representing key institutions of Ministries of Agriculture, Public Health and Environment as well as NGOs who were trained on data entry of inventory of useable and obsolete pesticides, registered list of pesticides, importers and distributors into PSMS. Good progress was made on the entry of inventory data collected in 2009 and the list of registered pesticides in Cameroon. Expertise and capacities built in the country under this phase are planned to be extended to Central African Economic and Monetary Community (CEMAC) member countries. The mid-term evaluation deems the approach very appropriate and sensible.

44. In Mali, the ASP-project team is working on the development of PSMS national preparation for its extension to other CILSS member countries. The overall objective of the Network is to provide support to the National Committee of Management of Pesticides (CNGP) in each CILSS country to implement the common pesticide registration and post registration regulations to prevent the accumulation of obsolete pesticide stocks and to protect human health, animal, the environment and biodiversity. A TCP regional pilot project was prepared by the executive CILSS Secretariat and submitted to FAO for technical assistance to further support the PSMS work in Mali and to share experiences with other CILSS countries. A Letter of Agreement (LoA) between FAO and the Project Management Unit (PMU) of ASP-Mali has been prepared for the implementation of PSMS planned activities in CILSS countries and Benin.
45. **In the Caribbean**, the system is deployed for 16 countries\(^1\), and all have received training and Personal Protective Equipment (PPE). Most countries have carried out inventories. Training on PSMS was also held in Santiago, Chile for participants from Paraguay, Bolivia and a single focal point for the Caribbean who is responsible for running the PSMS for the Caribbean countries. Work is under way to develop a common database of pesticide registries to meet the needs of the Caribbean countries. It is expected that the development of such system would help them to make better informed decisions on the registration of pesticides.

46. **In the Pacific**, PSMS has not yet been deployed. The 5 target countries\(^2\) have agreed to the development of a central pesticide registration database hosted by SPC. Staff at SPC will be trained in the use of PSMS with data entry planned before the end of 2011.

2) **Masters degree course for pesticide registrars at Cape Town University**

47. A postgraduate distance-learning course on pesticide risk management was launched at the University of Cape Town (UCT) on 28 March 2010. The course comprises a series of core modules based on the requirements of the International Code of Conduct for the Distribution and Use of Pesticides published by FAO. EC funding is supporting the participation of regulator from Botswana (2), Lesotho (2), Zimbabwe (1), in addition to two regulators from the Pacific and one from the Caribbean. Other regulators from Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique South Africa and Zambia are supported through funds mobilized from GEF and TCP projects.

48. The mid-term evaluation finds this course very useful with a positive impact on the countries by providing the necessary support to their pesticide regulators to allow them to administer pesticides at national level in accordance with the Code.

3) **Guideline and systems development in pesticide life-cycle management**

49. FAO has been active in the area of provision of technical guidelines to countries. A series of technical guidelines related to pesticide life-cycle management has been successfully developed including: inventory of pesticides; environmental management tool kit (EMTK) volume 1 (risk assessment), and volume 2 (storage and transport); prevention of accumulation; container management; and registration of pesticides. Additional guidelines (EMTK) volumes 3 (environmental assessment) and volume 4 (implementation of safeguarding and disposal options) have been prepared. FAO has also completed a technical guideline on pesticide registration and has elaborated a guidance note related to soil remediation based on the very successful experience carried out in Mali.

50. Furthermore, the monitoring and evaluation system has been refined and improved will be applied in some countries as part of a trial before roll out to other country projects.

---

\(^1\) Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago and Suriname.

\(^2\) Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu.
51. The mid-term evaluation appreciated the effort deployed in the area of provision of technical guidelines to countries, considered the quality of the published guidelines very satisfactory and recommended speeding up the operational use of the M&E system.

4) **Communications and awareness**

52. A communication and visibility plan for the project was developed and endorsed by the EC. Regular project updates are published on the ACP MEAs newsletter and website.

5) **Coordination and consultation**

53. Several meetings were organized to foster coordination, collaboration and information sharing at regional and interregional levels. These meetings were very fruitful notably in the area of fund raising using the EC project as seed funding especially in Africa and the Pacific.

4.2.2 **Regional priorities**

1) **Africa region**

West Africa:

54. **CILSS**: As described in cross-cutting issues (1) a pilot project is under way in Mali to develop a national network to use PSMS as a tool for the enforcement of registration and post registration of pesticides in different sectors in the country.

55. A regional workshop on needs assessment for the enforcement of pesticides management was organized in Bamako, Mali, in August 2010. The workshop elaborated a concept note to address pesticide management in a comprehensive way. The following priorities were identified: Review of current regulatory and institutional framework, development of post registration monitoring system, deployment of PSMS, communication and awareness rising.

56. A LoA between FAO and the Institute of Sahel (INSAH) was prepared to carry out: a) preliminary assessment of the functioning of the common registration system in the CILSS countries; b) study of pesticide market and the impact on food security; c) assessment of post registration activities and d) socioeconomic assessment of pesticide use.

57. In Benin, following a request from the Government of Benin for assistance to dispose of the stock of Endosulfan which was banned in 2009, FAO organized 3 missions under this project, estimated the stock of obsolete pesticides including Endosulfan to 600 tonnes which should be eliminated and identified the following activities as priorities: Inventory update of obsolete stocks and associated waste, disposal of these stocks, promotion of alternatives to Endosulfan, and review of the implementation of the code of conduct on the distribution and use of pesticides using the pesticides life cycle approach. A LoA between FAO and PAN Benin on raising awareness of the risks associated with the use of Endosulfan has been prepared.

58. The EC project resources have been used successfully to leverage an amount of US$2.5 million from Japan as a contribution to safeguard and remove obsolete pesticides in Benin.
59. A project information file (PIF-FSP) on the development of a programme on risk reduction of pesticides was submitted to GEF under the fifth replenishment. In addition, a TCP project was prepared to fund safeguarding strategy and disposal of Endosulfan.

60. In Burkina Faso, the last inventory, conducted in 2004, indicates the existence of 126,000 litres of liquid products, 2,910.72 kg of solid pesticides and 119,415 empty containers. Nine technicians from Burkina Faso have benefited from the regional training on inventory of obsolete pesticides and related waste in July 2011. Burkina Faso has signed an LoA for a GEF project related to the elimination of POPs and obsolete pesticides and capacity building for sound management of pesticides in the CILSS member countries. In addition, a project on pesticide management was elaborated and submitted to SAICM for funding (USD 350,000).

61. Furthermore, coordination is also made with the PIP-COLEACP programme on pesticides risk reduction in fruits and legumes funded by the EU and implemented by COLEACP. An LoA has been signed recently in September with the aim of coordinating activities in CILSS countries in order to avoid duplication.

Central Africa/ Cameroon:
62. A training session on the safe inventory of pesticides was organized in July 2009 and the necessary equipment was provided for this purpose. A national focal point and team have been nominated by the government to coordinate activities related to the inventory of pesticides. A training session on PSMS was organized in June 2010 and four engineers among those trained were selected to enter inventory data collected in 2009 and the list of registered pesticides in Cameroon. Good progress has been made and the inventory is almost completed. In addition, a full sized project information file (PIF) has been prepared, and will be submitted to the GEF Secretariat for co-financing under GEF5.

East Africa:
63. In Malawi, the project has identified approximately 400 tonnes of obsolete stocks to safeguard and dispose. A project concept note for the disposal of the stocks has been agreed with the Government of Japan for funding. A TCP project on pesticide life-cycle management was approved in March 2011 and plans remain to develop a GEF supported POPs project by the end of the year.

64. In Kenya, the project has identified approximately 200 tonnes of obsolete stocks, which require safeguarding and disposal. Thirty tonnes have already been safeguarded with the contribution of CLI, and EC funds will support the disposal of the stocks already safeguarded. A plan for the collection and safeguarding of the remaining stocks was developed. A preliminary safeguarding training by a waste management company was completed in late 2010.

65. A TCP project on pesticide life-cycle management was launched in March. A GEF 5 project aimed at dealing with contaminated sites, pesticide burial sites and the problems from use of old pesticide containers was developed.

South Africa:
66. In Botswana, FAO has developed GEF supported pesticide management and disposal project. The GEF project submission was finalized in March 2011 and project
implementation under the MEA resources is expected before the end of 2011. This will include the disposal of approximately 100 tonnes of obsolete pesticides currently stockpiled by the Government of Botswana.

67. The MEA funds are supporting two members of the Plant Protection Service to complete the UCT pesticide risk management course. PSMS will also be adopted as the main tool to manage pesticide import, distribution and usage.

68. In Swaziland, a FAO TCP project linked to the safeguarding and disposal of approximately 100 tonnes of obsolete stocks, composed mainly by Arsenical powders, was approved in December 2010. EC MEA project resources have been allocated to support the aforementioned safeguarding activities. The stocks are scheduled to be sent for disposal in late 2011. The project will also deploy PSMS and potentially support the participation of one of the pesticide regulation staff in Swaziland in the second intake of students for the UCT pesticide risk management course scheduled for March 2012.

2) Caribbean region

69. In the Caribbean region, the project is supported by the FAO Subregional Office based in Barbados and the data entry for the establishment PSMS is being done by a consultant based in St. Lucia with accountability to the pesticides risk reduction group staff, located at FAO headquarters in Rome, acting as PCU. Separately, Suriname as the base for the recently established CAHFSA, is providing technical support to the Bahamas and Trinidad and Tobago.

70. The activities detailed in the Logframe –Caribbean Region Activities (Annex 5) are informed by priority issues identified by participating countries during the inception workshop in Guyana in June 2009. In developing the work plan, FAO took account of other initiatives currently taking place, such as by the Organization of American States (OAS) and the USDA/USEPA, in order to determine the likely synergies that could emerge therefrom.

71. The project funded country participation in the CGPC meetings in order to ensure active participation in project activities. The European Commission approved the work plan endorsed by the CGPC in December 2009. The regional priorities were the elimination of existing stockpiles of obsolete pesticides, awareness raising as regards the proper use of pesticide, monitoring of pesticide residues, harmonization of pesticides legislation in the Caribbean and the enforcement of requisite regulations.

72. It was envisaged that the project support information sharing and provide expertise to review the various registration systems in all countries; as well as review the issue of implementing a harmonized pesticides registration process and facilitate the training of pesticide registrars in reviewing data for the registration process. The work programme of priorities identified was being implemented; however, some activities have lagged due to limited capacity in the countries to take action and the absence of a regional mechanism for monitoring the activities. According to FAO, efforts on the part of the project to engage CARICOM, CAHFSA and other regional entities have been fruitless because the organizations are not set up for this kind of initiative. As a result, consultants and the FAO offices in the region have been used to keep activities running.
73. To date, the project has facilitated training on how to conduct the inventory of obsolete pesticides and environmental risk assessment, included a ‘Training of Trainers’ component to develop participant skills to train other professionals in their respective countries, in all CARICOM member countries (Haiti included), Cuba and the Dominican Republic and the creation of a regional hub, based in St. Lucia, for the PSMS which works well as regards the coordination of data entry. Thus far, completed inventories from Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines have been completed and validated.

74. Barbados, Cuba and Jamaica have submitted some of the obsolete pesticides data. The Bahamas, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Trinidad and Tobago, the Dominican Republic and Suriname are all at varying stages in the inventory process. It is anticipated that all national inventories will be completed by December 2011.

75. Further progress by countries that have completed the inventory exercise is dependent on the completion of the inventory exercise and the data entry for all countries by December 2011. The information will then be analysed and interpreted to guide the process of developing an action plan for the safeguarding stage of the project in the Caribbean region.

76. Training in safeguarding measures for the handling of hazardous materials and repackaging of such materials in preparation for shipment and disposal was recognized as a critical component of the project. It was proposed that two teams of experts, one from Suriname and the other from Jamaica, would be trained in safeguarding procedures and, additionally, two individuals from the University of the West Indies, St Augustine Campus would participate in this training. Further, these teams will be responsible for safeguarding activities in all countries.

77. As regards safeguarding these stocks, there is a plan to engage a specialist team for the region to repackage the small amounts in each country, once the inventory is complete. This was discussed and agreed at the last CGPC meeting (Jamaica, June 2011). It should be noted that the Government of St. Lucia, through the Ministry of Agriculture, contracted a Canadian firm which has completed the repackaging and safeguarding at excessive cost of US$40,000 per ton while FAO projects normally cost about US$2,500-US$4,000 per ton.

78. The pesticide legislation and registration has been analysed by an international expert and on the basis of his findings, countries will decide, during the next workshop on harmonization of pesticide registration planned in St Lucia from 8-11 November, on their preferred way towards regionally harmonized pesticide registration.

79. The communications strategies are under development. Many activities in relation to awareness raising are conducted as part of the routine work programme of the respective agencies at the national level, particularly during Pesticides Awareness Week held annually in late September. Notably, in Jamaica for instance, strong linkage with the Ministry of Agriculture and other civil society organizations, such as farmers groups; in ensuring good agricultural practices at the farm level and further proper inventory management of pesticides at the community and household levels, does not feature sufficiently.

80. On pesticide residues, FAO has been in contact with USDA and EPA to coordinate efforts and ensure effective assistance in developing awareness and capacity for residue monitoring and compliance with export requirements for pesticide residues in agricultural...
commodities. USDA contributed to the June 2011 CGPC meeting by running a full day on pesticide residue issues. USEPA will contribute to the registration workshop in St Lucia in November.

3) Pacific region

81. The priorities set by the Pacific countries were designed around the following components:

- Component 1: Regional harmonization of legislation
- Component 2: Contaminated soil/sites
- Component 3: Container management
- Component 4: Alternatives and integrated pest management
- Component 5: Communications and awareness.

82. SPREP was tasked with Components 2 and 3. SPC was tasked with the implementation of Components 1, 4 and 5.

83. FAO reviewed the logframes for the Pacific region in parallel with the mid-term review, providing clarity on the activities within the scope of the ACP MEA funds, and those outside the scope. These revised logframes are included in an Annex to the report.

84. Under Component 1 (Regional harmonization of legislation), inputs have proceeded close to the anticipated schedule. Regarding pesticide legislation, harmonization of registration activities and training of pesticide regulators, all activities have been satisfactorily completed. New legislation has not yet been drafted, but is planned once the regional registration system is in place. On the institutionalization of a centralized database, the PSMS at SPC, training of SPC staff has not yet commenced, but is expected to in late 2011.

85. This component is effectively moving towards reaching its objectives. Participating countries are engaged in the process of legislative and pesticide registration harmonization. The involvement of the Governments of New Zealand and Australia in providing technical assistance and hosting project meetings is positive and indicates the relevance of the activities to neighbouring countries.

86. Under Component 2 (Assessment of contaminated sites), it was concluded that the University of the South Pacific does not have the analytical capacity to complete the required analysis. SPREP completed its input of confirming national focal points for contaminated sites across the region. The FAO-recruited consultant completed a preliminary review of contaminated sites, but samples have not yet been collected. Work is ongoing by FAO to improve this input and to continue with the development of draft site specific environmental management plans. It should be noted that the focus of this component has shifted from contaminated sites, to pesticide burial sites. In response to this shift, FAO is planning a sampling programme incorporating sites in Samoa, Tonga and Niue. The most high risk of these sites will then be remediated during the GEF-PAS projects, and other identified sites will be addressed under the TCP.

87. Under Component 3 (Container management), an FAO-recruited consultant completed an initial assessment of container management needs in Samoa. A consultant has
also completed work on containers in Tonga and Fiji; however, the report was not available during the mid-term evaluation. A detailed feasibility study is scheduled to be completed in late 2011, followed by the initiation of collection of the containers and establishment of a system to run for collection of materials under the supervision of a contractor. Under the GEF-PAS project, equipment is to be supplied by GEF PAS project to process the containers into useful products. This approach will be replicated under the TCP funding (proposal still under development).

88. Under Component 4 (Alternatives to chemical pesticides), SPC inputs have proceeded on schedule, with the TCP detailing further inputs, submitted for FAO approval in early 2011.

89. Activities to be executed have been carefully considered and outlined in the TCP. According to FAO, the TCP funding has been approved and execution of TCP activities will begin in September 2011. All activities detailed in the logframe have been adequately completed and Component 4 of the ACP MEAs project is considered complete.

90. Under Component 5 (Communications and awareness raising), SPC inputs have included the development of a communications strategy. Indeed, a review of communications needs based on formats provided by FAO developed under the ASP was completed by the communications team at SPC in collaboration with national NGO and government focal points in the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. An associated TCP has been developed by SPC, and the submission process is under way. Once the TCP is approved, communications and awareness activities will commence.

4.2.3 Government support

91. Governments consulted for this review are very concerned of the current risk posed by the existing stocks to public health and the environment but lack the necessary resources and capacities to undertake safeguarding, disposal and management to reduce these risks; so they are supportive and enthusiastic about the project activities and contribute satisfactory to the success of the implementation of the project through their full commitment, their active participation in various meetings/workshops and the nomination of focal points to monitor the project activities.

4.2.4 Project management

92. The project is managed by FAO/PCU team of the Pesticides Risk Reduction group of the Plant Production and Protection Division (AGP) located at FAO headquarters. The organizational and managerial skills of this team, which relied on few persons (mainly three technical officers and one information management clerk), as well as its experience and commitment to the project have been an important factor for the progress accomplished.

93. In Africa, it is implemented through FAO offices in collaboration with the government focal points and the ASP structure in place. In the Pacific and Caribbean regions project implementation is coordinated through the FAO Sub-regional Offices, in collaboration with regional organizations: SPC and SPREP in the Pacific; and CGPC through member PCAs, in default of CARICOM, in the Caribbean providing facilities for the implementation of project activities.
94. In general, collaboration with regional institutions was good. However, in the Pacific consultations indicate lack of collaboration with SPREP during the first year of the project. Since the appointment of the Solid Waste Manager at SPREP, work has progressed; however, efforts are still required to improve communication.

95. In the Caribbean region, the lack of a functioning project management structure has compromised the implementation of some project activities.

4.2.5 Technical and operational backstopping

96. Administrative and technical backstopping has been provided by the FAO/PCU. It has brought considerable technical experience, enthusiasm and commitment to the project. It also provides direct management support to a series of country projects allowing significant progress made in a number of key areas related to pesticides management and fund raising. Indeed, as described above, the FAO/PCU with the official government’s representatives met with several potential donors in different countries and sub-regions to enable effective response to requests for assistance from the countries.

97. Technical backstopping has also been provided by consultants. The FAO/PCU uses mostly the expertise already developed in the area of pesticide management and disposal of obsolete pesticides and associated wastes in the ACP regions. For instance, in Mali where the ASP programme has been very successful, expertise developed through this programme is being used effectively in various activities including inventory implementation, PSMS deployment, safeguarding of emergency sites, specifications for disposal contracts and selection procedures of disposal company.

98. To a large extent, the consultants engaged have provided very satisfactory technical inputs to the project. The only deficiency was reported from the Pacific region where the consultant recruited to develop the TCPs (for Components 2 and 3) appears to have developed less comprehensive proposals. To rectify the situation, the FAO/PCU took immediate action to provide technical support to ensure the development of comprehensive TCP activities that meet the needs identified by PICs.

5 Assessment of results and effectiveness

5.1 Effects and impact

99. The project is intended to assist ACP countries in identifying and moving towards elimination of obsolete pesticide stocks, while building capacity to manage pesticides throughout their lifecycle more effectively, thereby preventing further accumulation.

100. To a large extent, since the inception of the project, very satisfactory progress has been made in terms of national capacity building in the area of pesticide management by training local staff in appropriate practice on pesticide stocks management.

101. Training activities at different levels will contribute to wider dissemination of knowledge and greater awareness of pesticide management issues. Indeed, the mid-term
evaluation noticed, notably in Mali where the ASP programme is very successful, that great effort is made to increase general public awareness of environmental and public health risks related to pesticides and on training of pesticide distributors, users, agricultural extension staff and others, as well as an increase in the capacity of regional and local governments to safely and effectively manage pesticides.

102. The regional pesticide registration system as well as the PSMS will contribute significantly to improved pesticide management in all targeted countries, and to enhanced control of use. The mid-term evaluation believes that the PSMS database will be a major tool in the countries for overall pesticides management. Indeed, the deployment of the PSMS database to the ASP-1 countries for the management of pesticides has facilitated the processing of inventories of obsolete and usable pesticides - and the initial environmental risk assessments - for the countries, which have completed their inventories. The inventory of pesticides and their quality are now accurately monitored and updated and their movements are tracked.

103. It should be emphasized that the PSMS database has shown great potential as a tool for facilitating use of stocks of pesticides by transferring pesticides for locust control from countries which have an excess of pesticides to those which are in immediate need. There have been examples of successful transferring of pesticides from Mauritania to Yemen and from Mali to Malawi and Mozambique.

104. Globally, the project results will contribute to prevent the accumulation of pesticides stocks and therefore to protect human health and environment from pesticides including POPs. They will also contribute to support the development of the agriculture sector by reducing inputs of pesticides and promote the use of Integrated Pest Management (IPM). If successfully executed, IPM activities will significantly reduce reliance on pesticides for key, heavy-pesticide use crops, and are expected to be replicated by governments, thereby increasing internal resources.

5.2 Sustainability and environmental impact of results

105. The prevention of the re-accumulation of obsolete pesticide stockpiles is the main factor for sustainability after the project. Significant activities have been programmed and are conducted on this issue. This includes mainly reforms of pesticide regulations of the countries and the harmonization of the legislation and registration, an increase in general public awareness of pesticide issues and training of pesticide distributors, users, agricultural extension staff, NGOs and others. The prioritization of these issues within the government development agenda ensures the sustainability of the results. In addition, the involvement of NGOs in pesticide safety, health and other environmental issues enhances the chances of sustainability of the results.

106. Regarding the environmental impact, the results contribute to the international efforts to eliminate persistent organic pollutants, improve management of toxic chemicals and promote alternatives to pesticide usage that include IPM and integrated vector management (IVM).

107. The results also contribute to the strengthening of natural resource management by supporting enhanced pesticide management, the conservation of scarce water supplies
through supporting clean up of a site where underground water has been contaminated by pesticide spillage.

108. In general, the results contribute to the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on POPs and also to the achievement of the objectives of other international agreements such as the Basel, Bamako, Rotterdam and Biological Diversity Conventions.

5.3 Gender Equity in project implementation and results

109. The project makes no specific reference to gender issues and there is the implicit assumption of gender sensitivity. The communications and awareness strategy is required to pay due attention to gender issues, particularly at the household level in relation to the management of pesticides and pest reduction. The fact that women are responsible for family health makes them more responsive to information on pesticides risks and the usefulness of IPM techniques.

110. Indeed, women and men do have functionally differentiated roles in relation to agricultural production and pesticides handling and due account must be taken of these differences when designing and implementing approaches towards effective pesticides management and pest reduction.

111. Sex disaggregated statistics is a precursor to the process of mitigating a gender gap and consequently all information systems must provide for the collection and management of sex disaggregated data sets where appropriate.

5.4 Cost-effectiveness

112. Project coordination is done by the PCU of the pesticides risk reduction group, at FAO headquarters, in the role and functions of technical support unit for the combination of regional cross-cutting and country level activities among ACP countries. It is deemed that this approach allows for the consolidation of existing initiatives in order to maximize the gearing and leverage effects of this FAO component to the MEA project in the ACP countries.

113. Given the limited resources, FAO has been working to raise additional funds through the TCP Facility and partnership activities in order to achieve all activities included in the logframe. Furthermore, the FAO/PCU has taken steps to streamline the available resources in order to achieve the prioritized activities in the best cost-effective way. Among the actions which have allowed for significant cost savings with satisfactory results the following are mentioned:

114. The use of the capacity developed in the region. The expertise already developed in the area of pesticides management and disposal of obsolete pesticides and associated wastes, particularly through the ASP programme, including inventory implementation, PSMS deployment, safeguarding of emergency sites, specifications for disposal contracts and selection procedures of the disposal company is used for the benefit of all the regions.
115. Inputs from the PCU in lieu of consultants such as the supervision of activities and the completion of the technical guidelines needed done by PCU staff allowing savings on consultant costs.

116. The mission considers that the project has served as an effective means for achieving the immediate objective within the limited resources available.

5.5 Major factors affecting the project results

117. The lack of funds is the main constraint to achieve all the identified project activities so the inputs to the ACP countries were lower than originally envisaged in the work plans. There have been, some difficulties in the processing of payments between the EC and FAO. This had a direct impact on the timeframe for the project implementation in number of countries.

118. Continuity of project supported activities depends on the mobilization of additional resources. Leveraging and partnership activities were deemed necessary to generate additional funds to execute all project activities (included in the comprehensive logframes), and to have a significant impact on the stated development of objectives. As already stated, significant success has been achieved in this area particularly in Africa and the Pacific.

119. In the Caribbean, the absence of a regional project management unit has also delayed the pace of implementation of the project. The CGPC, in default of CARICOM, facilitated the staging of the 2009 inception workshop as well as subsequent project planning and capacity building workshop at the time of the CGPC annual conference in 2010 and 2011 in Suriname and Jamaica respectively. The project funded country participation in the CGPC meetings in order to ensure active participation in project activities. A sustainability strategy is needed to ensure continuity beyond the life of the project.

120. In the Pacific, there is little communication between SPREP (tasked with Components 2 and 3) and SPC (tasked with Components 1, 4 and 5), although such communication would be useful to ensure project activities are coherent, and that the project functions as a single and integrated project entity, as opposed to two discrete projects. It is noted that these two organizations often compete, as opposed to collaborate; however, consultations indicated that both SPC and SPREP would welcome increased communication.

121. Regarding consultant recruitment, one of the consultants recruited in the Pacific, although showing sound technical experience, did not demonstrate the necessary temperament to represent an international organization at regional meetings. His inability to produce outputs in a timely manner also impacted on the delivery of components under SPREP management. Under the MoU between FAO and SPREP, SPREP is responsible for Components 2 and 3; however, FAO is responsible for consultant recruitment. This apparent conflation of responsibilities requires careful balance. Although SPREP not responsible for consultant recruitment, they are responsible for the communications with country representatives, and, ultimately, for the execution of SPC. For effective execution, the consultant recruited needs to work closely, collaboratively and transparently with SPREP.
6 Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

122. Evidence gathered during the mid-term evaluation process reveals that the project is very relevant to the needs and priorities of ACP countries, as this relates not just to pesticides but to hazardous chemicals in general. Despite some difficulties in implementing the planned activities within the agreed timeframe due to lack of funds and the limited capacity in some countries to take action, the project globally made good progress to achieve its goal.

123. During the first year of implementation, cross-cutting areas and regional priorities were identified through a consultative process, which engaged the main stakeholders in each region.

124. With respect to the cross-cutting areas, capacity has been built in several countries in Africa and the Caribbean to use the PSMS to collect and share information on pesticide stocks in a standardized format. In the Pacific, the use of PSMS has not yet been deployed but will be introduced before the end of 2011.

125. A postgraduate distance learning course on pesticide risk management for regulators was launched at the University of Cape Town and regulators from the three regions are attending the first course. Technical guidelines related to pesticide life-cycle management and pesticide registration were developed and a guidance note related to soil remediation based on the very successful experience carried out in Mali was elaborated. Several workshops/events have been organized to foster consultation, collaboration and coordination within the three regions.

126. At the regional level, the inventory of obsolete pesticides (output 1) has been completed in some countries (Malawi, Kenya, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines). In the remaining project countries it is either ongoing (Swaziland, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, 10 Caribbean countries) or planned for 2011 (Botswana, Trinidad and Tobago). It is anticipated that all national inventories will be completed by December 2011. Safeguarding of stocks (output 2) has been completed in St Lucia and is in progress in countries where inventory activities have been completed (Kenya and Malawi) or planned for the end of 2011 (Swaziland and Suriname). Similarly, disposal of stocks (output 3) is foreseen to take place at the end of 2011 in the abovementioned countries. The assessment of contaminated sites was completed in Fiji, Samoa and Tonga.

127. In terms of capacity building in pesticide management (output 4), the enforcement of a common registration system and its harmonization with other pesticides registration regulations in the respective regions has been agreed by the concerned authorities in CILSS countries and in the five target countries in the Pacific. Key activities to design the regional systems have begun. In the Caribbean region, the pesticide legislation and registration has been analysed by an international expert and on the basis of his findings, countries will decide on their preferred way forward during the next workshop on Pesticides Registration and the Rotterdam Convention planned in November 2011 in St. Lucia.
The development of communications and awareness strategies on the importance and dangers of obsolete stockpiles, highly hazardous pesticide formulations and pesticide hazards and alternatives has begun in Africa with the support of PAN-Africa, in the Pacific with the involvement of the SPC, and is planned in the Caribbean with the collaboration of the University of the West Indies.

Promotion of alternatives to chemical pesticides, through farmers’ capacity building on IPM will start soon in the Pacific and in Africa.

The FAO project coordination unit (PCU) made considerable efforts to assist countries to access additional funds. The project contributes to the national capacity building in the area of pesticide management by training local staff in appropriate practice. Training activities at different levels contributes significantly to wider dissemination of knowledge and greater awareness on pesticide management issues.

During the field visits, the mid-term evaluation has also noticed the country ownership of the project with the involvement of various government institutions, environmental and public health NGOs and other civil society.

A key factor for the sustainability of the achievements is the prevention of recurrence of pesticide stocks. The combination of the appropriate institutional and regulatory capacity, a long-term management of pesticides mainstreamed into government-funded systems and the increased public awareness should ensure the sustainability of these achievements.

It should be emphasised that the use of pesticides will never be completely abandoned. All the preventive measures, which are developed within the project, will surely contribute reducing the use and the accumulation of pesticides but pesticides will still to be applied for a long time due to economic pressure. Therefore, the mid-term evaluation considers that the following deserve to be taken into account in the second phase of the project:

The need to broaden the scope of prevention to include improving pesticide application techniques. The improvement of these techniques will contribute to reducing risk of accumulating obsolete stocks simply because improved methods would result in reduction of pesticide orders.

The establishment of environmental monitoring teams for agricultural practices with task, to handle quality control of pesticide treatments, environmental and human health monitoring and management of empty pesticide containers while ensuring their institutionalization. Such teams called QUEST (Quality and Environment Survey Treatments) have been successfully operational for locust control operations in some countries affected by the last desert locust upsurge of 2004-2005.

**6.2 Recommendations**

Given the satisfactory results achieved by the project despite the limited resources available, the mid-term evaluation strongly recommends continued support to the project in order to achieve all the planned activities as well as the initiation of a second phase of the
project to allow extension of the strategies developed to new countries and to meet the growing demand for assistance in eliminating obsolete pesticide stocks or in addressing other aspects of pesticide management. Furthermore, the mid-term evaluation makes the following specific recommendations:

**Recommendation 1.** For the Africa region

| Develop a specific logframe for the Africa region providing clarity on the activities within the scope of the ACP MEA funds, and those outside the scope. |
| Accelerate the implementation of ASP phase 2 to anticipate resolving the problem of increasing quantities of obsolete pesticides in African countries. |
| Develop a contingency plan for major pest control at national and regional level to ensure coordination between different actors and to avoid any accumulation of pesticides notably in locust control. |
| Strengthen the CNGP capacities of the CILSS countries on pesticide management by training its staff notably on the use of PSMS. |
| Hasten the signing of LoAs between FAO/ASP Mali, to deploy the PSMS to all CILSS countries, and between FAO/INSAH to carry out the following studies: a) preliminary assessment of the functioning of the common registration system in the CILSS countries; b) study of pesticide market and the impact on food security; c) assessment of post-registration activities; and d) socioeconomic assessment of pesticide use. |

**Recommendation 2.** For the Caribbean region

| CARICOM through COTED, formally engage CGPC, with support from CAHFSA, to establish the regional stakeholder platform that is required for participatory ownership and action geared towards the efficiency implementation of the project in the Caribbean region. |
| For sustainability of this intervention beyond the life of the project, due attention must be paid to updating the legislative, policy and institutional/social frameworks for sound pesticides management and pest reduction at both the national and regional levels. |
| It seems opportune to consolidate the operationalization of the project in the region by strengthening the capacity and capability of the CAHFSA to mobilize for the acquisition of the required funding. |
| This revised approach should be communicated to stakeholders attending the proposed regional training workshop on Pesticides Registration and the Rotterdam Convention in November 2011 in St. Lucia. |
**Recommendation 3. For the Pacific region**

For the Pacific region, the institutionalization of the PSMS at SPC. Work on this is yet to begin. Training of SPC staff in the PSMS should be undertaken as a matter of urgency. Primary data collection through sampling of contaminated soil, and risk quantification through rapid environmental assessment of sites in Samoa, Tonga and Niue should be undertaken as soon as possible, site prioritized and remediation plans developed. It is recommended that FAO provide training to SPREP staff, and that SPREP conduct the sampling program, with FAO completing the data analysis and risk profiling in consultation with SPREP. Feasibility study of container recycling for Samoa should be completed as an immediate priority. Comparative review of container management needs in additional four countries should also be initiated. Consultants for container activities should consult closely with SPREP, as well as FAO. Communications and awareness activities should be fully integrated into technical activities being undertaken in Components 1-4. This will require consultation with SPREP on key messages to be relayed, and key stakeholders, under Components 2 and 3.

In order to encourage collaboration between the SPREP and SPC managed sections of the project, FAO should consider establishing a project management group, including key personnel at SPREP and SPC, and update them monthly on project activities via email.

---

**Recommendation 4. Overall Recommendations**

Further intensify efforts to find additional funds to complete all planned activities. FAO staff is encouraged to continue to work through internal channels to ensure the TCPs presented are approved for funding in this biennium, thereby ensuring they can be executed quickly. Encourage the use of national and regional expertise gained in earlier projects to assist, at lower cost, the new countries in the implementation of their project particularly for training, inventory, safeguarding activities and soil decontamination. This contributes to promote South-South cooperation. Intensify the implementation of communication activities and visibility focusing on the outputs and impact of the project targeting general and specific audience particularly at country level.

---

**7 Lessons learned**

137. The mid-term evaluation identified the following lessons learned:

**Lessons learned 1.**

Consultants not meeting their respective TORs and producing poor quality deliverables impacts the technical robustness of the project and also the relationship between project partners and beneficiaries. A lack of identifiable experienced consultants in key areas resulted in selected consultants being required to complete assignments, outside their area of specialization. This project is assisting in building capacity of regional consultants to ensure this problem is prevented in the future.

**Lessons learned 2.**

In the Pacific, SPC and SPREP were selected for their respective comparative advantages and are executing discrete project components. Communication between these two organizations would, however, ensure complimentarity of activities and prevent duplication. Improved coordination could be provided in the form of a monthly update email by SPC and SPREP, noting key activities undertaken in each component.
Lessons learned 3.
In the Caribbean, the commitment of 16 countries in a simultaneous process of inventory of obsolete pesticides inventory was an ambitious undertaking and it may have been prudent to group countries, based on an assessment of readiness, by way of a phased approach.

Lessons learned 4.
Other aspects of the detailed situation analysis such as environmental risk assessment, emergency safeguarding and review of pesticide management capacity through legislation/IPM/life-cycle management have lagged in the Caribbean due, in the main, to poor strategic management of the project implementation process.
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6. The overall EC contribution to the MEAs Programme is equivalent to Euro 19.5 million, of which Euro 4,448,220 supports the FAO project.

Project objectives

7. The project goal is to reduce adverse impacts on human health and the environment from excessive and poorly managed pesticide use.

8. The overall outcome is capacity building of the ACP countries to effectively manage pesticides in accordance with the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use
of Pesticides, the Rotterdam, Stockholm, Basel and ILO Safety and Health in Agriculture Conventions.

9. The immediate objectives are to assist the ACP countries in:
   • Eliminating existing obsolete pesticide stocks;
   • Exploring opportunities for reduction of reliance on synthetic chemical pesticides in agriculture; and
   • Preventing the creation of obsolete pesticides.

10. The project has four major outputs to be achieved in each participating country:
    • Obsolete and usable pesticides inventory and risk assessment available;
    • Obsolete pesticides safely repackaged;
    • Obsolete pesticide stockpiles safely disposed of in up to 10 countries; and
    • Pesticide management, policies and strategies put in place.

Major activities and outputs to date

11. During the inception phase, the project facilitated multi-stakeholder consultative processes to identify regional priorities and to develop detailed plans of action for the three regions. As a result of these processes, a number of cross-cutting areas with relevance to all countries has also emerged. Budget allocations for the regions/areas have been made accordingly.

12. The role of FAO is to ensure that countries participating in the project have access to the necessary technical support to achieve the planned activities. The project has therefore focused on the following areas in the project countries:
    • Inventory of obsolete and usable pesticides and associated wastes, registered lists of pesticides;
    • Inventory data entry into FAO Pesticide Stock Management System (PSMS);
    • Development of communication and awareness strategies on the risks posed by highly hazardous pesticides and the promotion of alternatives to chemical pesticides;
    • Pesticide legislation and regulation; and
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13. Regarding cross cutting activities, the project has ensured the following:
    • Coordination, development and launch of a master degree course on pesticides management at Cape Town University;
    • Development of guidelines in key areas related to pesticide life-cycle management: inventory, environmental risk assessment, storage and transport, prevention of accumulation, container management and registration of pesticides; and
    • Development of a communication and visibility plan to be implemented throughout the project’s lifespan.

2. Purpose of the mid-term evaluation

14. The project started in April 2009 and will end in March 2013. It is operational in the following countries:
• Africa: Benin, Botswana, Cameroon, Kenya, Burkina Faso, Chad, Cape Verde, Gambia, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Malawi, Mauritania, Niger Senegal and Swaziland.
• Caribbean: Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad & Tobago.
• Pacific: Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tonga

15. This mid-term evaluation is intended (i) to assess progress made and difficulties encountered so far during the project implementation and (ii) to provide the donor, FAO and project participating countries with practical recommendations, measures and actions to achieve the project objectives as planned in the project document. These recommendations should take into consideration available project funds and other resources in each country/region to readjust project priorities.

16. The evaluation should also assess the likelihood that the objectives of the first phase of the FAO subcomponent under MEAs ACP Programme will be achieved in March 2013 and recommend the priorities for the second phase of the project.

3. Scope of the mid-term evaluation

17. With respect to the FAO subcomponent, the mission should assess:
   a) the relevance of the project to the needs and priorities of project countries;
   b) the clarity and the quality of the project document and specifically:
      • The logic relationship between inputs, activities, outputs to achieve the project objectives;
      • Determination of prior obligations and prerequisites for project implementation (assumptions and risks);
      • Institutional relationships and framework for implementation of the project work plan;
   c) Coherence and coordination with other projects contributing to the project objectives in each region. In the case of Africa, the project activities should be coordinated with ASP on the prevention and elimination of obsolete pesticide stocks or other projects contributing to sound pesticide management and risk reduction in the region, ongoing and in preparation FAO/GEF projects for the management of Persistent Organic Products (POPs) and the projects on Integrated Pest Management (IPM). In the three region, the project activities should be coordinated among others with PIP – COLEACP programme funded by EU and implemented by Europe-Africa-Caribbean-Pacific Liaison Committee, an inter professional network promoting sustainable horticultural trade through pesticides risk reduction and promoting bio pesticides;
   d) Efficiency of project implementation including availability of funds, FAO inputs; managerial and work efficiency; implementation difficulties; adequacy of monitoring and reporting; the extent of national support and commitment and the quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by FAO;
   e) Project results including a full and systematic assessment of outputs produced to date (quantity and quality as compared with work plan and progress towards achieving the immediate objectives);

18. The mission will specifically review progress made and achievement related to the four expected results/outputs:
R1: Obsolete pesticides inventory, pesticide data management system, and risk assessment (RA) available;
R2: Strategy for safeguarding of obsolete pesticides developed;
R3: Strategy for safe disposal of obsolete pesticides developed, including tender for required contracts; implementation of local actions for waste management and management and supervision contracts;
R4: Strategy for sound pesticide management and pesticide reduction developed in collaboration with all stakeholders. In particular, the mission should evaluate progress made in the following areas:
- Enforcement of pesticide registration and post registration regulations;
- Utilization of systems to manage statistics on import, use and current stocks of pesticides;
- Pesticide reduction and use of alternatives to conventional chemicals; and
- Management of empty pesticide containers and small pesticide stocks.

In the addition to the above, the mission should assess:

f) The effectiveness of the pesticides risk reduction group staff in its role and functions as technical support unit and coordinator of the project, including the rationale of the location at FAO HQs; and

g) The quality, quantity and timeliness of the implementation of the planned activities, including produced training materials, technical documentation, guidelines and legal frameworks as well as operational approaches to disposal operations in beneficiary countries.

19. Based on the above analysis the mission should draw specific conclusions and make proposals for any necessary further action by the country or host institution, FAO, the donor and/or the governments to ensure that project outcomes and benefits are sustained in the longer term, including any planned activities of the project and any need for additional assistance. The mission will draw attention to any lessons of general interest for future.

20. Any proposal for further (financial) assistance should include precise specification of objectives and the major suggested outputs and inputs.

4. Composition of the mission

21. The mission will comprise:

- One international expert in project evaluation with experience in pesticide management issues and possible expertise in the area of evaluation for Africa;
- One international expert in project evaluation with experience in pesticide management issues and possible expertise in the area of evaluation for the Caribbean; and
- One international expert in project evaluation with experience in pesticide management issues and possible expertise in the area of evaluation for the Pacific.

22. The experts should be independent and not involved in the project formulation, implementation or backstopping.
5. **Timetable and itinerary of the mission**

23. The midterm evaluation is planned during July - August in representative samples of countries in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific. International experts will visit the following countries in the assigned regions:
   - In Africa: Mali, Benin and Burkina Faso
   - In the Pacific: Fiji and Samoa
   - In the Caribbean: Suriname and Jamaica

24. The experts should spend an appropriate number of working days in each country, including a briefing and debriefing session with relevant stakeholders, FAO and EC Representations. The mission will be coordinated by the FAO Pesticides Risk Reduction group, Plant Production and Protection Division, Rome and a specific itinerary and an agenda will be arranged for each international expert prior to his/her mission.

6. **Consultations**

25. The mission will maintain close liaison with the Representatives of the donor and FAO and relevant national agencies, as well as with national and international project staff. Although the mission should feel free to discuss with the national counterparts all questions relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Governments, the donor, or FAO.

7. **Reporting**

26. At the end of each visit to the country, the mission should present its preliminary conclusions and recommendations at a debriefing meeting. The mission is fully responsible for its independent report which may not necessarily reflect the views of the concerned Governments, the donor or FAO. The report will be written in conformity with the headings shown in the Annex.

27. Each expert is responsible for the preparation of his/her report, which will be submitted to FAO Pesticides Risk Reduction group for its consolidation with the other parts related to the other regions; within two weeks of mission completion. The consolidated report will be circulated to relevant stakeholders for comments, within ten days. Upon receipt of comments, the experts should have two days to incorporate these comments when appropriate and finalize the report.

28. FAO will submit the report to the Governments, key institutions and the donor, detailing the actions which FAO will undertake in relation to each recommendation.
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African region

Benin (13-18 August 2011)

FAO
- BALEPA Elisabeth, FAO Representative
  Elisabeth.Balepa@fao.org
- AKADIRI, Falilou, Assistant Programme FAOR
  Falilou.akadiri@fao.org
- AISSI, Marcelline, Assistant Administration FAOR

Minister of Health
- KOUEA Henriette née HOUSSOU, Director of Direction de l’Hygiène et de l’Assainissement de Base (DHAB).
  kourahenriette@yahoo.fr
- OUSSOUNOU Richard, Chef of ‘service d’Hygiène Publique’ (DHAB)
  richardoussou@yahoo.fr
- SEGALA G. Hadéhou, Chef of ‘service de Planification et de vulgarisation’ (DHAB)
  segladehou@yahoo.fr
- KPINSOTON Gabriel, Chef of ‘Service de l’Assainissement de Base’ (DHAB),
  Kpinsotou1960@yahoo.fr

Minister of Environment
- AIDJI Delphin, Focal point GEF
  ecartype@yahoo.fr
- OUDRO-DJERI Imourou, Stockholm Convention focal point
  djerbeth@yahoo.fr
- SIMEON Putcherie, Rotterdam Convention Focal point
  Simeonp69@yahoo.fr
- DASSI Etienne, Bale convention focal point
  etienetted@yahoo.fr

Minister of Agriculture
- VIGAN Olivier S.G of the Minister of Agriculture
  vigolive@yahoo.fr
- TIAMIYOU Ibouraima Chef of ‘Division de l’Inspection phytoSanitaire’ DAGRI
  tiamiyou@ yahoo.fr
- BOKONON-GANTA Aimé Entomologist DAGRI
- LIGAN Désiré Comité National d’Agrément et de Contrôle des Produits PhytoPharmaceutiques (CNAC – DAGRI)
  desireligan@yahoo.fr
- ZOGLOBOSSO Roland, Assistant of Secretary Permanent of CNAC
  rolandzr@yahoo.fr

AIC
- AGOUNNDOOTE Désiré, Director of ‘Développement de l’Association Interprofessionnelle du Coton’
OBEPAB
- VODOUHE Davo Simplice, Coordinator of ‘Organisation Béninoise pour la Promotion de l’Agriculture Biologique’, +22996691096.

SONAPRA, Société nationale de la Promotion Agricole
- GNANSOUNOU Gérard, Director (Trade)- Société nationale de la Promotion Agricole
- ISSAKA Ali Mamam, Responsible for the inputs
- DETNGNON Jean, Responsible for ‘mission promotion Filières Agricoles’
  jeandetongnon@yahoo.fr

CNIDIC Conseil National des Importateurs et Distributeurs des Intrants du Coton
- SALE Imorou, President of CNIDIC
  aic@intnet.bj

Mali (19–23 August)

FAO
- KEITA Sadio Manda, Assistant Programme FAOR Mali
  Manda.keita@fao.org
- SISSEKO Marie Bernadette, Assistant au programme FAO
  Marie.sessiko@fao.org

PASP
- SIDIBE Demba, Coordinator of ASP Programme (ASP-MALI)
  Demba.Sidibe@pasp-mali.org
- CAMARA Mamadou Responsible of Communication and awareness ASP-Mali
  Mamadou.camara@pasp-mali.org
- SYLLA Cheikh Responsible of disposal of obsolete pesticides ASP-Mali
  Cheikh.sylla@pasp-mali.org

Minister of Environment, DNACPN
- DAKOUO Félix, National Director, Direction Nationale de l’Assainissement et du Contrôle des Pollutions et des Nuisances DNACPN
  dakououf@yahoo.fr
- DIKITE Boubacar, Assistant Director DNACPN, Point focal Basel Convention
  diakoubaouca@yahoo.fr
- MODIBO Diallo, Chief of ‘Division Assainissement’ DNACPN
  Madibo57@yahoo.fr
- SISSIKO Balla, Point focal Stockholm convention
  balsissoko@yahoo.fr

Croplife
- SABLE Diarra, President of Crop life Mali
  diarrasabl@yahoo.fr

CMDT Compagnie Malienne pour le Développement du Textile
- CISSE Oussmane, Technical Adviser, Compagnie Malienne pour le Développement du Textile (CMDT)
ocisse@cmdt.ml, sisseous@yahoo.fr

PAN Mali
- DIARRA Yacouba, Coordinator PAN-Mali
diarrayacouba@yahoo.fr

CNLCP Centre National de Lutte contre le Criquet Pèlerin’
- DIAKITE Fakaba, Director of ‘Centre National de Lutte contre le Criquet Pèlerin’
fakabadiakit@yahoo.fr

INSAH-CSP
- DIARRA AMADOU, Permanent Secretary of CSP ‘Comité Sahélien des Pesticides’
diarra.amadou@yahoo.fr

Minister of Health
- MAIGA Boubacar Abida, National Director of Health
bamboure@gmail.com
- BOUARE Sory Ibrahima, Chief of ‘Division de l’Hygiène’
sory242000@yahoo.fr

Minister of Agriculture
- KELEMA Daniel Siméon, Director of ‘Direction Nationale de l’Agriculture’
kelemadaniel@yahoo.fr

European Union Delegation
- MOGOLLON Daniel, Chief of Section ‘Développement Rural, Environnement,
Sécurité alimentaire et Décentralisation’
david.mogollon@eeas.europa.eu, Phone 223 77176302

CNGP
- KONE Traoré Halimatou, Chief of service ‘Contrôle de qualité des Vaccins au
Laboratoire Central Vétérinaire’, Member of CNGP
halimatoutraore@yahoo.fr

Burkina Faso (24-27 August)

FAO
- RASOLO François, FAO Representative
francois.rasolo@fao.org
- Daouda KONTONGOMDE, Assistant FAOR (Programme)
- KONDE Boubacar, Assistant FAOR (Administration)
boubacar.konde@fao.org

Minister of Agriculture
- OUEDRAOGO Robert, General Director of Plant Protection DGPV
- OUEDRAOGO Amidou, Director of Plant Protection & Permanent Secretary of
CNCP amidououedraogo@yahoo.fr
- KAMBOU Paul, Chief service of pesticides DPV
kambouspaul@yahoo.fr
• KABORE Y. Etienne, Director of ‘des Intrants et de la Mécanisation Agricole (DIMA) : Direction Générale des Productions Végétales. etiennekabore@hotmail.com
• SANOU Yacouba, Service of pesticides DPV
• KIEMA K Raki, Chief of ‘service des Interventions DPV’, Phone: 70388844
• SOME D. Mariam, Chief of ‘service de Contrôle Phytosanitaire et de Qualité ‘ Phone: 50361915

Minister of Environment
• HONADIA Mamadou, Permanent Secretary of ‘Conseil National pour l’Environnement et le développement Durable’ (SP/CONEDD) georges.yaeogo@yahoo.fr
• SAVADOGO Paul Windipsidi, General Director ‘Direction Générale de l’Amélioration du Cadre de Vie’ DGACV Paul.savadogo@gmail.com
• YAMEOGO Georges, Director of ‘Conventions et Partenariat Environnementaux’
• SEMDE Idrissa, Adviser SP-CONEDD
• KERE Barthélémy Director of ‘Direction de l’Assainissement Prévention’ DGACV Barthelemy_kere@yahoo.fr
• OUEDRAOGO Désiré, Point Focal of Stockholm Convention desireouedraogo@yahoo.fr
• OUEDRAOGO Watta Director of ‘Education Environnementale’
• SALO R. Bruno, Point focal of Rotterdam Convention & SAICM; Responsible of ‘Bureau National des Evaluations Environnementales’ (BUNED/MEDD) salobruno@yahoo.fr

Minister of Health
• HIEN Maurice, General Director ‘Direction Générale de la Protection Sanitaire’ (DGPS) hienanwer@yahoo.fr

CILSS
• COULIBALY Dramane, Coordinator, ‘Programme Régional d’Appui Sécurité Alimentaire Lutte contre la Désertification Population et Développement.’ Dramane.coulibaly@cilss.bf

AGRODIA
• SAWADOGO Issiaka, President of ‘Association des Importateurs, Distributeurs des Intrants Agricoles ‘ (AGRODIA) agrodiabf@yahoo.fr
• BONDE Désiré, Permanent Secretary AGRODIA Desire06bonde@yahoo.fr

European Union Delegation
• RASMUSSEIN Christian Frigaard, Chief of Section ‘Développement Rural et Environnement’ Christian-friggard.rasmussen@ec.europa.eu
• TRAORE Abdoulaye Désiré, Chief of ‘Programme Sécurité Alimentaire ; Section Développement Rural’
CONACILSS
• OUEDRAOGO Delphine Bernadette, Permanent Secretary of CONACILSS
  oueddelphi@gmail.com

Caribbean region

Barbados

Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Fisheries and Water Resource Management
• Ralph Farnum, Chairperson-Pesticides Control Board and Deputy Chief Agricultural Officer
• Gennia Oxley – Scientific Officer II, Pesticides Unit, Ministry of Agriculture
• Nigel Reece – Pesticides Control Inspector, Ministry of Agriculture
• Wesley Walcott - Pesticides Control Inspector, Ministry of Agriculture
• Michael James – Agricultural Officer, Ministry of Agriculture
• Sandra Alleyne – Administrative Officer, Ministry of Agriculture

Barbados Agricultural Health and Food Control Project
• Beverley Wood - Project Co-ordinator

Environmental Protection Department
• Ingrid Lavine – Senior Environmental Officer
• Tonya Armstrong – Senior Environmental Officer

Jamaica

FAO
• Sharon Gabbidon, Secretary
• George Mignott

Pesticides Control Authority
• Michael Ramsay, Registrar
• Marcia Thompson, Assistant Registrar
• Hugh Ho Young

Jamaica Customs
• Claudette Hill, Occupational Health and Safety Officer

Belvedere Estate
• Wilson, Farm Manager

St. Lucia

PSMS Regional Hub
• Guy Mathurin, FAO Consultant

Pesticides and Toxic Chemicals Board
• Dunley Auguste – Chairperson

Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
• Hilary George - Head, Research Division
• Winston Elliott - Crop Protection Officer

Pacific region

Suva, Fiji (27-30 July 2011)

SPC
• Inoke Ratukalo, Acting Director Land Resources Division, SPC
  inoker@spc.int, Phone: +679-337-0733
• Losalini Leweniqila, Fiji National Market Access Coordinator
  PHAMA Pacific Horticultural & Agricultural Market Access Program, SPC
  l.leweniqila@phama.com.au, Phone: +679-337-0733
• Fereti Atumurirava LRD, SPC
  FeretiA@spc.int
• Morena Rigamoto, Country Manager, Live and Learn Environmental Education
  morena.rigamoto@livelearn.org, Phone: +679-3315-868

AgChem
• Ben V. Nand, General Manager, AgChem
  ben@agchem.com.fj
• Steven Yam, Seed & Pesticide, Importer and Retailer

EIA
• Aminiasi Qareqa, Principal Environment Officer (Waste/EIA)
  Dept. of Environment
  PO Box 2109, Fiji
  aminiasi.qareqa@environment.gov.fj, Phone: (679) 331-1699 / 979-8895

Apia, Samoa (30 July – 4 August)

UNEP
• Greg Sherley, Task Manager Biodiversity Conservation
  UNEP, Apia, Samoa
  greg.sherley@undp.org, Phone: (685) 27473/(685) 23670

SPREP - Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
• David Haynes, Pollution Prevention and Waste Management Advisor
  PO Box 240, Apia, Samoa, T +685 21929 DDI +685 66245 F +685 20231
  davidh@sprep.org
• Esther Richards, Solid Waste Officer, SPREP
  PO Box 240, Apia, SAMOA, T: +685 21929, F: +685 20231
  esherr@sprep.org
• Jill Key, ACP-MEAs Manager, Capacity Development Adviser
  jillk@sprep.org
  Seema Deo, Communications Advisor, SPREP
  seemed@sprep.org
MNRE (Waste and hazardous waste)
- Fuatino Leota, MNRE (Waste and hazardous waste team)
  fuatino.leota@mnre.gov.ws
- Kat Rasch, MNRE
  rasch.katenia@gmail.com
- Natasha Kolose, MNRE

SUNGO
- Rowena Vavatau,

Ministry of Agriculture
- Peletano, Pesticides Registrar (former)

FAO
- Maryanne Suisala,
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4) GCP/INT/063/EC: Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries - FAO Component: Clean-up of obsolete pesticides, pesticides management and sustainable pest management – **FAO Updated LogFrame**

5) GCP/INT/063/EC: Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries - FAO Component: Clean-up of obsolete pesticides, pesticides management and sustainable pest management - **Logical Framework – Caribbean Region Activities.**


7) **ACP MEAs Newsletters**: Vol.1, Issue 1, 2 &3; Vol.2, Issues 1, 2, 3&4; Vol.3, Issue 1.


9) Report of 14th Meeting of the Coordinating Group of Pesticides Control Boards of the Caribbean (CGPC), June 22-26, 2009, Guyana


17) Pesticides Stock Management System Consultancy – Caribbean Region: *Progress Report* – Guy Mathurin, October 2010


24) Completion of rapid environmental risk assessment according to FAO format, completion of sample collection and interpretation of analytical results followed by the development of a comparative risk assessment and remediation strategy, **Ron McDowall**, July 2011.

25) Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries - Capacity building to promote adoption of techniques to reduce hazardous pesticide use in Pacific Agriculture (GCP/INT/063/EC), SPC, [TCP proposal](#).

26) Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries: Component 5 - Communications and Awareness Strategy, **Emil Adams**.

27) Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries: Component 1: To develop a regionally harmonised system for pesticide registration in the Pacific (GCP/INT/063/EC), SPC, [TCP proposal](#).

28) Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries: Logframes Component 1-5, **Kevin Helps**.


34) Regional pests and pesticides management capacity buildings of the Comité Permanent Inter-etats de la Lutte contre la Secheresse dans le Sahel (CILSS) Member States. **GEF 5 PIF-FSP Template, January 2011**

35) Disposal of POPs pesticides and capacity building for sound pesticide management in the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS) member countries. **GEF 5 PIF-FSP Template, January 2011**.

36) Disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides and implementation of sound pesticides management programme. **PIF GEF 5 PIF-FSP Template Benin, January 2011**.
37) Disposal of POPs and obsolete pesticides and capacity building for sound pest and pesticide management. **PIF GEF 5 PIF-FSP Template Cameroon, January 2011**

38) Etat d’avancement du programme de prévention et d’élimination des stocks d’endosulfan et autres pesticides obsolètes existants **Aide mémoire de la mission de Ammati Mohamed 201124-29 Juillet 2011, Cotonou, Benin, 7pp.**

39) Atelier regional de renforcement des capacités des Etats membres du CILSS en gestion des pesticides Bamako 9, 10 & 11 août 2010 **FAO, Compte rendu de l’atelier 21pp.**


41) Gestion des pesticides dans les Etats membres du CILSS : Afro Technopole pour la gestion des déprédateurs et des pesticides. **Concept note, 8pp.**
Annex 4. Logframe Pacific region

Component 1.1: Legislation and Registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Time line</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of Legislation</strong></td>
<td>• Engagement with countries and request for review of existing legislation;</td>
<td>• Letters from Govt to FAO Office;</td>
<td>• SPC contact countries informing them of planned review;</td>
<td>• Letters from SPC sent out; Replies from countries confirmed</td>
<td>Jan ’10</td>
<td>SPC Focal points3</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Completion of gap analysis of legislation in targeted countries;</td>
<td>• National consultant review</td>
<td>• TOR for consultants and recruitment</td>
<td>• TOR approved</td>
<td>Jan ’10</td>
<td>LTU4 FAO Consultant LEGN</td>
<td>US$30K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Drafting of new legislation; Changes to Legislation to be done post adoption of the regional system for registration (1.2). Decision based on Regional consultation in May 2011.</td>
<td>• Legislation in target countries meets a minimum requirement as defined by FAO LEGN</td>
<td>• TOR for international consultant and recruitment</td>
<td>• Drafting of laws and public consultation completed</td>
<td>Feb ’10</td>
<td>LTU SPC Intl. consult</td>
<td>US$ 15K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adoption of new legislation;</td>
<td>• revised laws submitted for Ministerial / Cabinet approval</td>
<td>• All documents translated into local languages</td>
<td>• Laws translated into local languages</td>
<td>Aug ’10</td>
<td>NFP8 NFP NFP</td>
<td>US$10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Laws reviewed and approved by</td>
<td>• Nat consult / NFP</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Nil – all costs for the</td>
<td>US$ 5K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 SPC to confirm to FAO of country focal points for pesticide legislation in Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga and Vanuatu by end of November 2009;
4 LTU is the Lead Technical Unit at FAO HQ (Plant Production and Protection Division – AGP). FAO refers to the Regional Office for the Pacific in Samoa. LEGN is the FAO legal service in FAO HQ;
5 Assume 5 national consultants hired for 1 month (at a rate of US$250 per day for 20 days) plus SPC staff time (US$5K);
6 US$15K for intl consultant (Australia / New Zealand); US$5K for consultant travel; US$20K for round table costs in Nadi, Fiji organised by SPC; US$10K for national consultant costs to complete assignment; national consultation at govt own costs;
To be done as part of the TCP project once regional system is in place

Minister of Ag

Laws submitted into parliamentary time table

Laws reviewed by parliament

Laws pass onto statute books

SPC present findings to Heads of Agriculture meeting

TBA

TBA

TBA

NFP

NFP

SPC

account of the country including translation to local languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 1.2: Harmonisation of pesticide registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonisation of Pesticide Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 NFP is the national focal point
9 Country focal points to provide likely time line for completion of adoption process through national parliamentary processes;
10 Letter forms part of the single letter to countries from SPC notifying them of the findings from the MEA meeting in Samoa in November 2009;
11 Can only start when new legislation is drafted and submitted to parliament;
12 Based on 3 week consultant contract – possibly different consultant to legal reviewer for component 1.1. depending on experience;
13 Round table completed in Nadi in Sept 2010 with request from HOA FS meeting for TCP project to develop system, Follow-on meeting in Wellington New Zealand to review institutional arrangements for operation of the system in May 2011. Finalisation of TCP project and CEO sign-off in Canberra with AVPMA in Sept 2011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Time line</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement with SPC to host and maintain the system on behalf of the Region</td>
<td>Signed LoA specifying SPC responsibilities in the project</td>
<td>Detailed LoA with technical Annex submitted to SPC by LTU / FAO</td>
<td>LoA drafted and submitted to SPC; Signed LoA.</td>
<td>Feb ‘10</td>
<td>LTU / FAO</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| System installed at SPC | PSMS data base running with users set up for the Pacific Region | Technical requirements submitted to SPC | Technical requirements to SPC | Jan ‘10 | LTU | US$5
| To be done as part of the new registration system in late 2011. | | Countries agree to use system | Countries agree to use system | Feb ‘10 | NFPs | |
| | | SPC confirm tech needs are met | SPC confirm tech needs are met | Feb ‘10 | SPC | |
| | | Users loaded into system | Users loaded into system | Mar ‘10 | LTU | |
| | | | | | | |
| Training on use | All NFPs / nominated | Training of personnel | Training arranged | May ‘10 | SPC | US$25

Component 1.3: Pesticide stocks management system

Costs associated with fine-tuning the system to allow it to be run on a local SPC / Fiji based server;

Based on 1 week LTU mission to complete training and travel for national focal points to venue (Samoa);
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance of the system</th>
<th>persons and SPC complete training and are certified to use the system</th>
<th>by LTU</th>
<th>Training completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPC personnel to be trained in late 2011.</td>
<td>Entry of data for registered products</td>
<td>Registration data entered</td>
<td>Registration data verified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Linkage of PSMS to revised pesticide registration process | PSMS integrated into pesticide registration process and Customs import data | Consultant maps out data flow from registration process and integrates customs inputs | TOR for regional consultant completed and consultant hired |
| PSMS to be a main element of the new registration process based on recent registration tool enhancements to the system. | NFP Samoa trials data collection system on PSMS and customs data | Data flow for pesticide imports mapped | Data flow for pesticide import submitted to SPC / LTU |
| PSMS integrated into pesticide registration process and Customs import data | Review of system after 6 months of trials | Formats for reporting developed | System reviewed and report submitted to SPC / LTU |
| Consultant maps out data flow from registration process and integrates customs inputs | NFP Samoa trials data collection system on PSMS and customs data | Review of system after 6 months of trials | Data presented to CRGA / HoAFS |

| Roll-out of system to other main pesticide users in region; | PSMS integrated into pesticide registration system in region | SPC endorse system and present to countries | PSMS referenced in harmonised registration system |
| PSMS used as the main tool for logging registration data in region | On-going tech support and maintenance of the system provided to SPC | Up take of system by countries | New registration data entered into the system over 12 month period |
| PSMS integrated into pesticide registration system in region | SPC endorse system and present to countries | PSMS referenced in harmonised registration system | New registration data entered into the system over 12 month period |

| LTU | NFPs | NFPs | LTU | Nat Consult and NFP | NFP | NFP / Nat consult | SPC |

15 Costs to cover local / regional consultant to develop reporting formats and review of the process after trialling – SMS alert system to allow customs to inform MoA immediately should be considered but is not costed here;
## Component 1.4: Information exchange and capacity building/training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Time line</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Exchange and Capacity Building / Training</strong></td>
<td>Development of a pesticide regulators forum for information exchange and discussion</td>
<td>• Pesticide regulators meet regularly for on-line discussions on relevant subjects and for general information exchange on pesticide issues</td>
<td>• Invitations to regulators to join the existing University of Cape Town (UCT) “Vula” chat room sessions</td>
<td>• Pesticide regulators invited to join Vula chat room</td>
<td>• Jan ’10</td>
<td>• LTU / UCT</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part of the Comms TCP but seed funding from EC. TCP goes a lot further than this component.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore interest and potential for development of a local forum for on-line chat</td>
<td>• Pesticide regulators join sessions (monitored using Vula system)</td>
<td>• Feb ’10</td>
<td>• NFPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regulators are surveys to determine need for local system</td>
<td>• Regulators are surveys to determine need for local system</td>
<td>• July ’10</td>
<td>• SPC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Costs for local system defined and proposal developed for funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sept ’10</td>
<td>• LTU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training of pesticide regulators Underway.</td>
<td>• Critical mass of experienced, well trained personnel available in the region to assist in the management of pesticides</td>
<td>• Identification of candidates to complete the course</td>
<td>• List of candidates provided to FAO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US$40K16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to information / applications for the Masters Course in pesticide risk management at UCT;</td>
<td>• Data on course circulated to SPC and NFPs</td>
<td>• Jan ’10</td>
<td>• SPC / NFPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Part funding of participants to complete the course</td>
<td>• Applications to join the course completed by selected candidates</td>
<td>• Feb ’10</td>
<td>• UCT / FAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates are accepted on course</td>
<td>• Mar ’10</td>
<td>• NFPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Candidates complete the course</td>
<td>• Apr ’10</td>
<td>• UCT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dec ’12</td>
<td>• NFPs / SPC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

16 To cover travel and course costs for participation of up to 5 selected candidates (countries and SPC). All other costs to be covered by alternative funding secured by the candidate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Time line</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Contaminated site assessment</td>
<td>Engagement with countries and request for data on known and suspected contaminated sites;</td>
<td>Letters from Govts to SPREP and FAO Office;</td>
<td>SPREP contact countries informing them of planned review and requesting data;</td>
<td>Letters from SPREP sent out; Replies from countries confirmed</td>
<td>Feb ’10</td>
<td>SPREP</td>
<td>US$3.5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of existing data on contaminated sites;</td>
<td>Development of rapid environmental risk assessments of all known sites</td>
<td>TOR for regional consultant and recruitment; All previous POPs in PICs data made available; Completion of data reviews by countries;</td>
<td>TOR approved</td>
<td>Feb ’10</td>
<td>LTU18</td>
<td>US$15K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk quantification via sampling plan;</td>
<td>Detailed analytical report on high risk contaminated sites; Prioritisation based on risk to public health and environment</td>
<td>TOR for regional consultant and recruitment; Analytical survey by accredited laboratory (regional); FAO sampling and analytical protocols</td>
<td>TOR approved and consultant hired</td>
<td>Mar’10</td>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>US$15K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remediation plan development and project proposal preparation;</td>
<td>Site specific environmental management plans for</td>
<td>All analytical data; All site risk assessment data;</td>
<td>TOR for consultant approved; Intl consultant hired; All data provided to consultant</td>
<td>Apr ’10</td>
<td>LTU19</td>
<td>US$16.5K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 SPREP to confirm to FAO country focal points for environment issues across the region by end of Feb ’10;  
18 LTU is the Lead Technical Unit at FAO HQ (Plant Production and Protection Division – AGP). FAO refers to the Regional Office for the Pacific in Samoa;  
19 Consultant identified provisionally as the University of the South Pacific which has completed similar work for previous projects (based in Fiji); Problem with capacity and alternative needed  
20 Assume 1 Regional consultant hired for 1 month plus operational costs;  
21 US$15K for regional consultant (Univ South Pacific); US$35K sampling costs; US$70K Analytical costs; US$10K for regional consultant to complete assignment and final report;  
22 US$13.5K to cover intl consultant from University of Auckland for 30 days at US$450 a day. No travel required.
Highlighted activities to be completed as part of the EC project resulting in the development of a remediation plan under GEF (Samoa) and TCP (Niue) funding.
Issues with capacity at the USP in Fiji have resulted in a re-think of how to complete the sampling exercise. Initial survey has confirmed that the majority of locations of concern are not simple contamination sites from spillages but are burial / disposal locations which require a more in-depth review and greater care in their remediation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun ’10</td>
<td>Intl consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July ’10</td>
<td>SPREP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep ’10</td>
<td>Intl consult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

US$16.5K to cover workshop costs in Samoa organised by SPREP.
Component 3: Container management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Time line</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Container Management</td>
<td>Assessment of existing containers recycling initiatives in the Region</td>
<td>• Comparative review of container management needs in 5 key countries; • Pilot container management strategy for application in 1 country; • Cross ref to legal review where container management must be reflected in the law and regulations.</td>
<td>• Data on pesticide imports and existing stockpiles from countries; • Intl. Consultant to complete review of existing status and develop strategy; • Round-table meeting at SPREP with countries;</td>
<td>• Letters from SPREP to national focal points requesting data on container management issues; • Replies from countries confirmed • TOR approved and Consultant hired; • Consultant mission completed; • Round table meeting completed; • Comparative study report issued; • TCP / GEF project defined.</td>
<td>• Mar ‘10 • Apr ‘10 • Mar ‘10 • May ‘10 • Jun ‘10 • July ‘10 • Aug ‘10</td>
<td>• SPREP • National Focal Points (NFP) • LTU • SPREP • Intl consult • Intl consult</td>
<td>US$ 50&lt;sup&gt;24&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Roll-out of strategy | • Pilot project endorsed by selected county; • Pilot project is operational for 9 months trial period; • Numbers of contaminated containers are assessed. | • Agreement with country to operate system (MoU); • Equipment and monitoring system; • Communications campaign to encourage container return (cleaned); • Bye-in from the pesticide distributors (collection points); • Bye-in from government to release containers already collected (write off value in audit); • Govt personnel to manage | • MoU signed (FAO – Govt); • Equipment procured and delivered; • M&E and comm plans developed; • Formal notification to act as collection points from distributors; • Waiver from Govt to allow inclusion of existing collected containers; • Launch of collections and media day; • Inspections of containers completed to ensure all are | • Sept ‘10 • Nov ‘10 • Jan ’11 • Feb ’11 • Mar – Sept ’11 • Mar – Sept ’11 • Oct ’11 | • LTU / NFP • FAO / NFP • NFP • NFP • NFP / FAO • SPREP / NFP • NFP | US$65K<sup>25</sup> |


<sup>25</sup> Comprises US$50K for equipment plus US$5K for NFP travel and US$10K for operating expenses (funded through alternative GEF / FAO TCP allocation);
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recycling / treatment of collected containers.</td>
<td>• Containers are recycled</td>
<td>Jan ‘12</td>
<td>Recycler</td>
<td>US$ 15K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Agreement with suitable end-of-pipe disposal / recycling option (identified as part of initial study);</td>
<td>Nov ‘11</td>
<td>Govt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring of operations;</td>
<td>Dec ‘11</td>
<td>LTU / NFP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contract signed with recycler to accept waste;</td>
<td>Jan ‘12</td>
<td>Recycler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recycled product inspected and tested;</td>
<td>Jan ‘12</td>
<td>LTU / Intl cons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recycled product used.</td>
<td>May ‘12</td>
<td>SPREP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation report</td>
<td>• Cost and technical feasibility report on operations</td>
<td>Jan ‘12</td>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>US$ 15K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultant to complete review of operations;</td>
<td>Mar ‘12</td>
<td>Intl cons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dissemination of report and case study by SPREP to other countries in Region (Agenda item on annual meeting).</td>
<td>May ‘12</td>
<td>SPREP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TOR for consultant approved and consultant hired;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report completed;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Report adopted by SPREP and disseminated to parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 Travel and inspection / analysis costs (Funded through alternative GEF / FAO TCP allocation).
### Component 4: Alternatives to chemical pesticides:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Time line</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Alternatives to chemicals</strong></td>
<td>• Baseline assessment;</td>
<td>• Critical assessment of all existing IPM initiatives in the Region with identification of potential projects of regional benefit;</td>
<td>• Country data on IPM, organic agriculture, biocontrol and aromatics (SPC) initiatives; • Review of data by LTU; • Assessment of options for potential projects (outlines).</td>
<td>• Requests for data sent out by SPC to NFPs; • Data submitted to SPC for collation and initial review; • Initial report on data from LTU; • Drafting of concept notes for further work on IPM in the region.</td>
<td>• Feb ’10 • Apr ’10 • June ’10 • Aug ’10</td>
<td>SPC</td>
<td>US$5K&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project document development;</td>
<td>• IPM project concept notes • Review of concept notes by region and endorsement; • Detailed project documents for IPM in commercial and subsistence level agriculture in FAO TCP format.</td>
<td>• Consultant IPM project formulation mission; • Regional IPM development workshop.</td>
<td>• Draft prodocs prepared based on feedback from concept notes; • Workshop dates and participants confirmed; • Workshop completed; • Project documents finalised;</td>
<td>• Sept ’10 • Oct ’10 • Nov ’10 • Dec ’10</td>
<td>LTU (IPM)</td>
<td>US$10K&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt; US$15K&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt; US$10K&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approval of project documents;</td>
<td>• Formal submission of project documents by countries to FAO for support through TCP route.</td>
<td>• SPC formulate submission for inclusion in HOAFS meeting; • Review of TCP proposals by FAO Regional Office, Samoa.</td>
<td>• Prodocs endorsed by SPC • Formal submission of prodocs to FAO for TCP support; • Prodocs presented to HoAFS meeting.</td>
<td>• Dec ’10 • Dec ’10 • May ’11</td>
<td>SPC / SPC</td>
<td>US$10&lt;sup&gt;31&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All done.

---

<sup>27</sup> SPC management and staff time costs for the full component  
<sup>28</sup> Regional IPM consultant  
<sup>29</sup> Workshop travel costs  
<sup>30</sup> Workshop operational costs  
<sup>31</sup> US$5K for operational costs for each SPC and FAO local office;
### Component 5: Communications and awareness raising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Communications and awareness raising</td>
<td>Establishment of Communications teams in Solomon Island and Vanuatu</td>
<td>Team members in both countries identified and notified to SPC / LTU</td>
<td>WWF Communications strategy doc; ASP NGO handbook from PAN-UK.</td>
<td>Comms strategy doc sent to NFPs in Solomon and Vanuatu; NGO handbook sent to NFPs in Solomon and Vanuatu; National team members confirmed.</td>
<td>Dec ’09 Dec ’09 Apr ’10</td>
<td>LTU / WWF LTU / PAN NFPs</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of Communications strategies</td>
<td>National Communications strategies developed for Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.</td>
<td>Country identifies specific inputs after analysis of comms strategy doc; NGO inputs to be clarified; Consultant inputs to draft document; Draft comms strategies developed.</td>
<td>Country inputs confirmed; NGO role and TOR developed; Consultant TOR developed and hired; Draft comms strategies developed.</td>
<td>June ‘10 June ‘10 Aug ’10 Nov ‘10</td>
<td>NFPs NFPs LTU / NFPs Consultant / NFPs</td>
<td>US$15K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endorsement of strategy</td>
<td>Identification of who develops and rolls out the messages contained in the strategy; Finalised comms strategy which can be used nationally and across the region Endorsement of strategy by HOAFS meeting</td>
<td>Hosting of meeting of stakeholders Organisation of meeting Critical review of strategies</td>
<td>Venue and stakeholders / participants confirmed (limited to 2 participating countries); Meeting organised and invitations / travel arranged; Meeting completed; Recommendations reviewed and incorporated into comms strategy document; Finalised comms strategy circulated for information and final comment; Final comments submitted and acted on; Document submitted to HOAFS.</td>
<td>Nov ‘10 Nov ‘10 Dec ‘10 Jan ’11 Feb ’11 Mar ’11 May ’11</td>
<td>NFPs/SPC/FAO NFPs/SPC/FAO NFPs/SPC NFPs NFPs NFPs SPC</td>
<td>US$15K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production of materials and pilot</td>
<td>Materials from strategy.</td>
<td>Contract with company to develop messages.</td>
<td>Suppliers identified;</td>
<td>June ’11</td>
<td>NFPs</td>
<td>US$50K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

32 2 national consultants (poss NGO) hired for 1 month each (at a rate of US$300 per day for 20days) plus operational costs of NFPs to develop outputs US$3K;

33 1 meeting to cover Vanuatu and Solomon Islands. Costs to cover travel arrangements for participants (US$12K) and operational costs of NFPs (US$3K);
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>roll out</th>
<th>Bids received;</th>
<th>June ’11</th>
<th>FAO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation of pilot roll-out in Solomon Islands and Vanuatu</td>
<td>• Contract placed;</td>
<td>Aug ’11</td>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent evaluation report on strategy, materials</td>
<td>• Contract completed;</td>
<td>Oct ‘11</td>
<td>Supplier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and uptake of roll-out</td>
<td>• Roll-out of materials</td>
<td>Dec ‘11</td>
<td>NFPs/NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultant and LTU time</td>
<td>• Consultant hired;</td>
<td>Jan ’12</td>
<td>LTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consultant and LTU time</td>
<td>• Mission completed;</td>
<td>Mar ’12</td>
<td>LTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Report issued;</td>
<td>• Report issued;</td>
<td>Apr ’12</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actions identified.</td>
<td>• Actions identified.</td>
<td>Apr ’12</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation report and action plan / assessment;</td>
<td>• Evaluation report submitted to SPC;</td>
<td>Apr ’12</td>
<td>LTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluation report submitted to SPC;</td>
<td>• Report included in HOAFS agenda (2012);</td>
<td>Apr ’12</td>
<td>SPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Report reviewed by HOAFS;</td>
<td>• Report reviewed by HOAFS;</td>
<td>May ’12</td>
<td>SPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adopted by SPC and rolled out to Region.</td>
<td>• Adopted by SPC and rolled out to Region.</td>
<td>June ’12</td>
<td>SPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review of evaluation and roll-out in Region</td>
<td>• LTU</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Endorsement by HOAFS;</td>
<td>• LTU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mainstreaming of comms materials into Regional</td>
<td>• SPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidelines.</td>
<td>• SPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCP project developed to allow for the completion of a comprehensive strategy which was felt to be a better option that the small scale work which could be done under this limited funding.

---

34 Contract to take into account need for common messages which can be applied to all countries, the use of humour in messages, links to state run media companies to reduce costs, translation into local languages etc. All to be specified in contract TOR.
Annex 5. Logical framework – Caribbean region activities

Prior to inception of this project, limited data was available on the baseline situation regarding pesticides in the countries where the project will be implemented. The initial activities of this project were designed to provide the baseline situation with regard to quantities of obsolete pesticides, number of pesticide poisonings, levels of environmental contamination in certain situations, problems with pesticide management and handling and food quality problems linked to pesticide use. This output of the initial investigations presents an action plan developed with national stakeholders to address prioritized problems. The action plan indicates what changes from the baseline are expected as the project progresses. The logframe should be seen as a living project guiding framework that can be updated and refined as the project progresses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Summary</th>
<th>Indicators/Targets</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Impact**    | Improve environmental management and sustainable development focusing on management of pesticides for environmental health – quality of life, sustainable agriculture – quality of growth, and protecting the global commons. | 1. Regarding the quantification of these indicators, see text above.  
2. reduced incidence of poisoning and deaths from pesticide misuse and mismanagement;  
3. reduced levels of environmental contamination from pesticides;  
4. Improved management and use of pesticides in accordance with international code of practice;  
5. Improved compliance of Caribbean countries agricultural exports with international standards on pesticides. | 1. Poisoning incident report;  
2. Environmental monitoring data;  
3. Use surveys;  
4. Residue monitoring reports and export data on consignment rejections due to unacceptable pesticides residues. | • Commitment of ACP countries to project objectives;  
• Existence of infrastructure to support project activities;  
• Continuing commitment of implementing organizations to project;  
• Compliance of stakeholders with law, codes of practice and best practice in pesticide provision and use. |
| **Outcome**   | Capacity in Caribbean countries for effective life cycle management of pesticides in accordance with the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides and Rotterdam, Stockholm and ILO Safety and Health in Agriculture Conventions will have been strengthened. | 1. Obsolete pesticides in Caribbean countries are fully inventories and high risk stocks are safeguarded;  
2. Pesticide management issues prioritized by countries have been measurably improved by building legal, technical, or human capacity or the provision of inputs. | 1. Inventory data  
2. Project M&E reports and country reports | • Sufficient technical expertise available;  
• Cost of packaging for obsolete pesticides does not rise significantly;  
• Existing indicative inventory data is close to actual obsolete pesticide stocks in countries;  
• Commitment of stakeholders to project implementation;  
• Sustainability of project actions is effective. |
| **Output**    | 1. Obsolete pesticides inventory and risk assessment (RA) Activities  
1.1 Recruitment of experts  
1.2 Training of trainers for safe and | 1. Trainers in each participating country trained to carry out inventory  
2. Completed inventory for each participating country | 1. Completed inventory database  
2. Training records  
3. National action plan for | • Obsolete pesticide stocks exist in the countries;  
• Commitment of national authorities to the |
| 1.3 | Training national teams for inventory and RA | 3. National action plan and environmental management plan for obsolete pesticide safeguarding in all participating countries | obsolete pesticide safeguarding process;  
• Active participation of trainees in the programme; |
| 1.4 | National inventory planning | 1.5 Equipment provision |  
| 1.6 | Data collection for inventories and RA in participating countries | 1.7 Data entry and analysis (PSMS) |  
| 1.8 | Development of national action plan for safeguarding of obsolete pesticides including environmental and social impact assessment. |  

### Output

#### 2. Pesticide safeguarding

**Activities**

- 2.1 Recruitment of experts
- 2.2 Procurement of containers, handling equipment and protective equipment
- 2.3 Creation and training of two regional safeguarding teams
- 2.4 Identification and preparation of centralization stores
- 2.5 Packaging and labelling of obsolete pesticides
- 2.6 Transportation to centralization stores
- 2.7 Secure storage

| 1. | All high risk obsolete pesticide stocks repackaged | 2. | Obsolete pesticides centralized in secure stores |

- 1. Inventory database
- 2. Records of repacked centralized obsolete pesticides

- Obsolete pesticides in countries are not too hazardous for locally trained personnel to handle;
- Suitable central stores exist
- Local personnel are willing to be trained and work on obsolete pesticide repacking and centralization

### Output

#### 3. Obsolete pesticides elimination

**Activities**

- 3.1 Prepare regional strategy for elimination
- 3.2 Tender for required contracts
- 3.3 Secure funds
- 3.4 Implementation of local actions for waste management
- 3.5 Management and supervision of contracts

| 1. | Regional plan for disposal of obsolete pesticides | 2. | Funds secured for elimination of obsolete pesticides |
| 3. | Dossiers for international tender of contracts for elimination of obsolete pesticides prepared | 4. | Materials not to be exported for destruction have been treated locally to eliminate hazards in ten countries (volumes depend on inventory) |

- 1. Plan document
- 2. Trust fund(s) established
- 3. Tender dossiers
- 4. Reports and records of work and destruction certificates

- Sufficient funds are available to complete destruction
- Suitable contractors participate in tender process
- Appropriate records and reports of work are maintained
5. Work has been completed with no injuries or environmental contamination incidents

### Output

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Legislation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Consultancy legal review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Workshop legal development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Prepare new legislation</td>
<td>1. Legislative review produced for each participating country;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Legal enforcement plan</td>
<td>2. Legal review workshop held in each participating country;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Training – new legislation</td>
<td>3. New pesticides legislation (if needed) drafted for every participating country that requires it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Legal enforcement plan drafted for each participating country;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Key senior staff in each country trained in scope and enforcement of new legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Pesticide post registration management capacity building</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Certification of pesticide users</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.1 Guidance on user certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Surveillance of health impacts of pesticides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.1 Guidance on health surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.2 Training on health surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.3 Health surveillance system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Guidelines for inspectors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Post registration guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Pesticide quality control guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Guidance document on pesticide user certification prepared;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Guidance document on health surveillance available; Training report &amp; no. of people trained; health surveillance systems established in at least one country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Guidance document for pesticide field inspectors produced;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Guidance document on post registration management of pesticides produced;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Guidance document on pesticide quality control prepared;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Consultancy report on legislative review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Legal review workshop report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Draft legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Enforcement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Training report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a need for new or updated legislation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relevant stakeholders are engaged with the process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approval of new or revised legislation progresses in a timely manner, within the timescale of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Public Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Communications strategy with sample materials for farmers, schools and public</td>
<td>1. Communications strategy developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Consultant/Expert to guide communications strategy</td>
<td>2. Communications workshop held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Regional workshop on communications</td>
<td>3. Communications materials available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Development of sample communications materials</td>
<td>4. Mechanism for countries to share communications materials and examples in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 Material sharing system in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Communications strategy document</td>
<td>1. Communications strategy document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Workshop report</td>
<td>2. Workshop report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communications materials and surveys of target audiences</td>
<td>3. Communications materials and surveys of target audiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evidence of countries sharing materials</td>
<td>4. Evidence of countries sharing materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suitable consultants or expertise are available;</td>
<td>• Suitable consultants or expertise are available;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholders maintain interest and engagement in the process;</td>
<td>• Stakeholders maintain interest and engagement in the process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agreed priorities can be implemented within available budgets and the project timeframe;</td>
<td>• Agreed priorities can be implemented within available budgets and the project timeframe;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Harmonized registration</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Review of registration requirements</td>
<td>1. Study of regional registration requirements highlighting similarities and differences;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Experience sharing from other regions</td>
<td>2. Circulation of examples of harmonized registration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Regional workshop on registration harmonization</td>
<td>3. Workshop on harmonized registration held;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Training on use and interpretation of registration data</td>
<td>4. Training programme on use and interpretation of registration data held;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Study report;</td>
<td>1. Study report;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Documents circulated;</td>
<td>2. Documents circulated;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Workshop report;</td>
<td>3. Workshop report;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feedback from trainees; training report</td>
<td>4. Feedback from trainees; training report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suitable consultants or expertise are available;</td>
<td>• Suitable consultants or expertise are available;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholders maintain interest and engagement in the process;</td>
<td>• Stakeholders maintain interest and engagement in the process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agreed priorities can be implemented within available budgets and the project timeframe;</td>
<td>• Agreed priorities can be implemented within available budgets and the project timeframe;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Residue monitoring</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Consultancy – How to use existing resources to best effect</td>
<td>1. CGPC member agreement on proposed strategy for residue monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Training on latest residue sampling and monitoring techniques</td>
<td>2. Number of people trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Adoption and use of MRLs</td>
<td>3. Agreed MRL system in place in countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Consultancy report on residue monitoring and CGPC meeting report</td>
<td>1. Consultancy report on residue monitoring and CGPC meeting report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training reports</td>
<td>2. Training reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Country reports and CGPC meeting reports</td>
<td>3. Country reports and CGPC meeting reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources exist that can allow residue monitoring to proceed;</td>
<td>• Resources exist that can allow residue monitoring to proceed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Skilled staff available to be trained;</td>
<td>• Skilled staff available to be trained;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Political will to accept regional approach to MRL adoption;</td>
<td>• Political will to accept regional approach to MRL adoption;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project funds and timescale are sufficient to implement recommendations.</td>
<td>• Project funds and timescale are sufficient to implement recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Salaries Professional</td>
<td>310,670</td>
<td>678,957</td>
<td>319,990</td>
<td>77,180</td>
<td>630,661</td>
<td>756,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Programme coordinator (P5 level)</td>
<td>70,727</td>
<td>228,614</td>
<td>72,849</td>
<td>54,538</td>
<td>143,576</td>
<td>283,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Snr Technical Officer Pesticide disposal (P5 level)</td>
<td>70,727</td>
<td>194,785</td>
<td>72,849</td>
<td>67,350</td>
<td>143,576</td>
<td>262,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Snr Technical Officer Pesticide Management (P4 level)</td>
<td>63,456</td>
<td>153,022</td>
<td>65,360</td>
<td>-44,707</td>
<td>128,816</td>
<td>108,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Project Administration, Finance and Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Officer (P2 level)</td>
<td>105,760</td>
<td>102,537</td>
<td>108,933</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>214,693</td>
<td>102,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Salaries General Service</td>
<td>49,575</td>
<td>112,841</td>
<td>51,062</td>
<td>58,260</td>
<td>100,637</td>
<td>171,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Admin &amp; support staff (1 G3)</td>
<td>49,575</td>
<td>112,841</td>
<td>51,062</td>
<td>58,260</td>
<td>100,637</td>
<td>171,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Total Staff Costs</td>
<td>360,245</td>
<td>791,798</td>
<td>371,052</td>
<td>135,441</td>
<td>731,298</td>
<td>927,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Consultants</td>
<td>63,456</td>
<td>37,040</td>
<td>163,928</td>
<td>266,675</td>
<td>102,537</td>
<td>303,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Regional consultant Caribbean</td>
<td>23,796</td>
<td>8,566</td>
<td>16,525</td>
<td>16,418</td>
<td>40,321</td>
<td>24,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Regional consultant Pacific</td>
<td>23,796</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>16,525</td>
<td>89,719</td>
<td>40,321</td>
<td>91,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Technical consultants international</td>
<td>7,932</td>
<td>26,951</td>
<td>79,320</td>
<td>124,859</td>
<td>87,252</td>
<td>151,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Technical consultants TCDC</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,830</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,796</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Technical consultants National</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,728</td>
<td>35,678</td>
<td>35,694</td>
<td>35,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contracts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54,863</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Obsolete pesticide destruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Local works (construction, land moving, transport)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Travel</td>
<td>74,032</td>
<td>89,740</td>
<td>60,812</td>
<td>309,583</td>
<td>134,844</td>
<td>399,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 International Travel project staff</td>
<td>39,660</td>
<td>61,779</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td>184,581</td>
<td>72,710</td>
<td>246,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Local Travel project staff</td>
<td>7,932</td>
<td>5,887</td>
<td>7,932</td>
<td>28,062</td>
<td>15,864</td>
<td>33,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Travel of national participants for regional workshops</td>
<td>19,830</td>
<td>22,080</td>
<td>13,220</td>
<td>96,940</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td>119,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 Evaluation &amp; programme coordination</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,220</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>7/1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>16,525</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,525</td>
<td>57,679</td>
<td>33,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>International training and refresher training</td>
<td>16,525</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,525</td>
<td>57,679</td>
<td>33,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Expendable Equipment</td>
<td>52,880</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52,880</td>
<td>35,915</td>
<td>105,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Personal Protective Equipment</td>
<td>13,220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,220</td>
<td>8,565</td>
<td>26,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>UN approved containers</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td>20,764</td>
<td>66,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Other project related materials (e.g. laboratory chemicals, inventory forms, cleaning materials etc)</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>6,586</td>
<td>13,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Non-expendable Equipment</td>
<td>33,711</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,711</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>67,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Pesticide handling &amp; storage equipment</td>
<td>19,830</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,830</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>Computer equipment</td>
<td>7,932</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,932</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>15,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>Other equipment (e.g. digital cameras, GPS apparatus)</td>
<td>5,949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Total Equipment</td>
<td>86,591</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86,591</td>
<td>36,243</td>
<td>173,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Technical Support Services</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td>9,943</td>
<td>66,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>General Operating Expenses</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td>38,096</td>
<td>33,050</td>
<td>75,268</td>
<td>66,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>666,949</td>
<td>956,674</td>
<td>819,872</td>
<td>890,831</td>
<td>1,486,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Administrative Costs (7%)</td>
<td>38,780</td>
<td>24,668</td>
<td>49,485</td>
<td>58,770</td>
<td>88,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>€ 705,729</td>
<td>€ 981,340</td>
<td>€ 869,356</td>
<td>€ 949,601</td>
<td>€ 1,575,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Project expenditures have been translated from US dollars into Euro as stated in the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA) using the following fix rates:
1 Eur = USD 1.27877238 rate of the contribution received in March 2009
1 Eur = USD 1.33868865 rate of the second contribution received in December 2010
1 Eur = USD 1.37362649 rate of the third contribution received in March 2011
Project Support Costs (administrative costs) calculated only against the Actuals and not against Commitments