

## 1- Identification

### 1.1 Project details

GEF ID	4668	Umoja No:	SB-001062.01.04	
Project Title	Demonstration of effectiveness of diversified, environmentally sound and sustainable interventions, and strengthening national capacity for innovative implementation of integrated vector management (IVM) for disease prevention and control in the WHO AFRO			
Duration months	<div>Planned</div> <div>Extension</div>	<div>60</div> <div>-</div> <div>Economy Division, GEF Chemicals and Waste, Chemicals and Health Branch</div> <div></div> <div>WHO</div> <div>-</div> <div>FSP</div> <div>Regional</div> <div>Africa</div> <div>Regional</div> <div>PoW 5: Chemicals, waste and air quality</div> <div>Chemicals and Waste</div>	<div>GEF financing amount</div> <div>Co-financing amount</div> <div>Date of CEO Endorsement</div> <div>Start of Implementation</div> <div>Date of first disbursement</div> <div>Total disbursement as of 30 June</div> <div>Total expenditure as of 30 June</div> <div>Expected Mid-Term Date</div> <div>Completion Date</div> <div>Expected Terminal Evaluation Date</div> <div>Expected Financial Closure Date</div>	<div>USD 9,550,000</div> <div>USD 308,218,797</div> <div>7-Mar-16</div> <div>24-Jun-16</div> <div>11-Jul-16</div> <div>USD 6,164,324</div> <div>USD 7,308,660</div> <div>1-Jul-19</div> <div>30-Jun-22</div> <div>-</div> <div></div> <div>31-Dec-22</div>
Division(s) Implementing the project				
Name of co-implementing Agency				
Executing Agency(ies)				
Names of Other Project Partners				
Project Type				
Project Scope				
Region <i>(delete as appropriate)</i>				
Names of Beneficiary Countries				
Programme of Work				
GEF Focal Area(s)				

**EA:** UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages

**EA:** Link to relevant SDG target(s) & indicator(s)

<p>Mozambique: The UNDAF 2017-2020 strategic objective is to achieve a situation where “The population of Mozambique, especially those living in the most vulnerable conditions, enjoy prosperity through equitable access to resources and quality services in a peaceful and sustainable environment”. The Government, with UN support international gender standards, equitable access to timely, quality and affordable health care and a healthy environment.</p> <p>Zimbabwe: The 2016-2020 Zimbabwe United Nations Development Assistance Framework (ZUNDAF) has a sustainable impact in its contribution to ending poverty, achieving gender equality, transforming all lives, and protecting the planet. The ZUNDAF offers opportunities to strengthen partnerships, linkages and programming, including those with other major development frameworks.</p> <p>Botswana: The United Nations Sustainable Development Framework (UNSDF) 2017-2021 focuses on strengthening coherence between Agencies, and promotes greater, accountability, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability in Botswana's pursuit of sustained and inclusive economic growth, social development and environmental protection.</p> <p>Namibia: The United Nations Partnership Framework (UNPAF) 2019-2023, strives towards partnership to enhance the coherence and efficiency to achieving the longer-term SDGs, the Africa Agenda 2063, and the country's human rights obligations and other commitments under internationally agreed conventions and treaties, including Social transformation, environmental sustainability and good governance.</p> <p>Eswatini: The UNDAF 2016-2020 aims to catalyze sustainable changes that will strengthen systems during and beyond the period covered (2016 – 2020). Three priority areas have been identified for the UNDAF; Poverty and inequality reduction, inclusive growth and sustainable development, Equitable and efficient delivery and access to social services, and Good Governance and Accountability.</p> <p>Zambia: The United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (2016-2021) vision is based on seven key principles, including: i) gender responsive sustainable development; iii) respect for human rights; and vii) private-public partnerships. Progress towards middle-income Zambia comes with addressing inequality, strengthening social protection and reducing vulnerabilities</p>	<p>The AFRO II Project is directly linked with the 2030 Agenda for SDG 1, 3, 6, 11, 12, 13 and 17 with their associated sub-goals and targets. The progress made towards respective goals, sub-goals and associated targets to which they contribute are as follows:</p> <p>- Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere; Targets 1.1, 1.2 and 1.5</p> <p>- Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages; Target 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.</p> <p>- Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all; Target 6.3.</p> <p>- Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable; Targets 11.1 and 11.5; sub-goals 11.a and 11.b</p> <p>- Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns; Target 12.4; sub-goal 12.a.</p> <p>- Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts; Target 13.3, and sub-goal 13.b.</p> <p>- Goal 17: strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development. Target 17.3, 17.9 and 17.17.</p>
---	--

## 1.2 Project description

## 1.2 Project Description

### Project Objective:

To strengthen national capabilities for implementation and scaling up of evidence-based, innovative, diversified and environmentally sound disease vector control interventions with multi-stakeholder participation within context of Integrated Vector Management

### Project Components:

Component 1: Promote evidence-based multi-sectoral policy-making for IVM and strengthen multi-sectoral alliance in the promotion & implementation of environmentally sound & effective innovative interventions for diseases vector control. Outcome 1: Countries develop and implement integrated cross sectoral policies, strategies and plans and have managerial capacity to fully comply with terms of the SC on the use of DDT for diseases vector control through implementation of IVM. Output 1.1: Capacity and systems to notify the SC DDT Register with close MoH/MoE collaboration. Output 1.2: National IVM strategies developed and regionally harmonized to the Global Vector Control Response. Output 1.3: National teams have technical capacity and equipment for entomological monitoring to inform national IVM plans and policies

Component 2: Support countries to implement IVM approaches and demonstrate effectiveness of diversified, environmentally safe innovative vector control methods including use of alternative chemicals to DDT for malaria control. Outcome 2: Three effective alternative IVM approaches demonstrated in at least 12 sites in 6 countries. Output 2.1: Maps of vector distribution and resistance compiled for demo sites and regional resistance database updated. Output 2.2: Three effective IVM approaches developed and demonstrated in six countries.

Component 3: Dissemination of knowledge and sharing of experiences to all stakeholders at national, sub-regional and regional level in order to influence decision making – evidence base. Outcome 3: Countries and regional institutions are using guidelines on IVM and social impact assessments to guide and influence policies on DDT. Output 3.1: Updated national and regional manuals and guidelines on IVM. Output 3.2: Better understanding of KAP related to malaria and raised awareness of IVM methods among communities and practitioners. Output 3.3: National assessments of social impact of DDT on vulnerable groups. Output 3.4: Data on DDT usage and amount/ location of obsolete DDT in project countries.

### Organizations Involved:

The Global Environmental Facility (GEF) – Funding Agency; UN Environment Programme (UNEP) – Implementing Agency; WHO-AFRO – Executing Agency; Countries (Ministries of Health, Ministries of Environment, others)– Executing bodies; and International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) - Executing Agency Contractor.

## 1.3 History of project revisions

Version	Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Rev0 (CEO)	24/06/2016	TM to Provide
Amend 1	21/12/2020	Reduce the amount of the contribution from UNEP to the Executing Agency, to extend the project duration, to revise the budget and related workplan to this Amendment to account for the reduced contribution and extended duration, and to clarify the reporting obligations of the Executing Agency.

## 2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

2.1 UNEP PoW

UNEP Subprogramme(s)

Subprogramme 5: Chemicals, waste and air quality

Specify the relevant Expected Accomplishment(s) & Indicator(s)

PoW 5: (a) (i)

TM: Progress towards delivering the stated PoW

A total of 11 countries have developed IVM strategies with the support of the project, the countries are Botswana, Eswatini, Liberia, Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Namibia, Uganda, South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Since last reporting, 5 more countries have formulated their IVM strategies.

2.2 GEF Core Indicators

GEF Core Indicators

N/A (This is a GEF - 5 Project)

N/A (This is a GEF - 5 Project)

## Indicative expected Results

-

-

TM

	PIR #	Rating towards outcomes	Rating towards outputs	Risk rating
FY 2021	5th	MS	MS	L
FY 2020	4th	MS	MS	M
FY 2019	3rd	S	S	L
FY 2018	2nd	S	S	L
FY 2017	1st	MU	MU	M

## 2.3 Impl status & risk\*

### Summary of status.

The implementation rate for the project slackened during the one-year reporting period ending 30 June 2021 due to persistent adverse effects of the Covid-19 pandemic. The six project countries made relatively moderate progress in the collection of data in demonstration sites and adaptation of policy documents. Despite the challenges of the pandemic, communication, technical assistance, and commitment by project staff and stakeholders had been maintained.

WHO has Technically supported overall project implementation in all six countries, including development of the IVM strategy in Madagascar, Mozambique and Zambia. ICIPE supported data collection efforts in six project countries and spearheaded drafting of preliminary scientific publications. Quarterly technical project implementation reports and financial reports including co-financing have been submitted in a timely manner by all project countries. Larvicides have been procured and delivered to Botswana, Eswatini and Namibia to facilitate timely implementation of the larviciding component of the demonstrations. All countries have collected epidemiological and entomological data for the 2020/2021 transmission season from the project sites including baseline data in Zimbabwe. All countries committed during the PSC meeting to prioritize implementation of component three activities by engaging local consultants. Annual project expenditure forecast, workplan and procurement plans have been developed for 2021.

To accelerate progress towards attainment of strategic priorities and targets of contributing towards the reduction and elimination of POPs, and to demonstrate alternatives, and reduction in use of DDT for malaria control in project countries, the following activities have been prioritized for implementation: Multisectoral coordination meetings, trainings and technical support; Collection of epidemiological and entomological data; Development of awareness communications / strategies and materials, conducting social impact assessments, and production of reports on DDT usage.

COMPONENT 1: The UNEP/BRS Webinar on reporting on the production and use of DDT under the Stockholm Convention: Questionnaire 2021 took place on 16 June 2021. Technical assistance has been provided for the development of Integrated vector management strategies in Mozambique (16 Nov – 31 Dec 2020), Zambia (10 May to 23 June) and Madagascar (24 May to 23 June). Zimbabwe has developed a draft that will be finalized under the auspices of the USAID/Vector Link Project (Co-finance). The total number of countries with IVM strategies is now 10 including Botswana, Eswatini, Liberia, Namibia, South Africa and Uganda. National stakeholder meetings have been held as part of the IVM development process in Mozambique, Zambia and Madagascar. AFRO received request from Mozambique for procurement of insecticide resistance tests kits and the procurement process has been initiated. Most countries conducted initial trainings and are in data collection phase. Mozambique and Namibia conducted entomological surveillance training in March 2021. The consultant for Social Impact Survey has been recruited and is working with the project countries.

COMPONENT 2: Technical support missions have been provided for Mozambique (week of 26 June) and planned for Botswana (2nd – 18th July). Monthly entomological sampling conducted in 134 households in Mozambique. In Zambia monthly entomological sampling of adult mosquitoes has been ongoing since January 2021 to date, with two fortnightly cohort surveys of malaria in children completed. Adult mosquito collection and larval survey with capacity building of project staff on Bti implementation and basic entomology are being conducted in Botswana. Entomological collections have been restricted to outdoor data collection in Eswatini and Namibia due to the pandemic restrictions. Training of project staff on Bti implementation and adult mosquito collections is scheduled for July in Eswatini. Material and equipment for pre-intervention entomological and parasitological surveys locally procured in June in Zimbabwe. Insecticide resistance reporting is ongoing as part of entomological data collection. All larviciding countries (Botswana, Eswatini and Namibia) managed to procure the larvicides. Two publications are under preparation for the house screening arm and three publications are under preparation on the Larviciding. An opinion paper on DDT phase out is planned and will include review of project results publications, DDT expert group, and WHO HQ DDT monitoring report, among others.

COMPONENT 3: A draft outline plan of regional technical outreach on project results has been developed with a list of publications and events to try and influence country malaria campaign design for 2022-2025. KAP survey completed in Eswatini, Namibia, Zambia. Baseline KAP survey completed on 21/05/2021 in Zimbabwe. KAP survey is currently being planned and dates for the survey will be advised when all logistics are in place in Mozambique. ICIPE iteratively developing appropriate IEC-BCC messages and pictures from surveys. ICIPE still working on modalities on KAP materials development with countries. Routine KAP surveys as part of post-intervention monitoring are Planned in Mozambique and Botswana and will be reported in ICIPE technical report. The regional consultant to assist the Executing Agency with component 3 has been recruited and is working with the countries. Meetings have been conducted by Consultant with WHO Country Representatives, and malaria and Environmental focal points in all countries. Zambia has conducted a steering committee meeting on component 3. Botswana, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe have confirmed MoE as the national partner to deliver the Social Impact Survey. Some countries have an agreement for Envt staff with direct payment by WHO Country Office; others need a transfer to MoH to pay. 2018-2020 data is needed for DDT Questionnaire (Nov 2021 deadline). Up to 2019 data is already compiled by WHO HQ. With the help of the consultant, Countries are compiling 2020 data including that of Obsolete DDT.

\*section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal

EA:Planned Co-finance (total only)

USD 308,218,797

EA: Actual to date:

95,958,548

## 2.4 Co-finance

**EA:** Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.

Despite signing of the agreement that entails reporting on co-financing, there is still minimal or lack of co-financing reporting, particularly by Tier II countries. The MTR highlighted the variability of co-finance figures across countries with unrealistically large amounts from Tier 2 countries which are not carrying the field demonstrations and recommended their revision as necessary. Modalities for reporting co-financing (in-kind and actual expenditure) by project countries were explored, including provision of clarity by availing a reporting template to capture programmatic co-financing (monetary/in-kind) by NPCs through programme managers using a standardized reporting format. Raised awareness of significance of prioritizing Co-financing reporting by countries in their annual reports and for tracking progress and should be. This co-financing would not necessarily be in cash but could, for example, refer to the monetary value of the contribution of the existing and running vector control program. WHO shared a template for co-finance, identifying typical items that can be included such as easily accessible total budget and co-finance initiatives for integrated vector management in quarterly and annual reports. WHO has embarked on efforts to review in-kind expenditure for Tier 2 countries and to ascertain that Tier 1 countries have revised their co-finance and include vector control programme expenditure.

**Instruction to EA:** text below is from last year's PIR. Please review and update.

**EA:** Stakeholder engagement  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The Executing Agency, WHO-AFRO has delegated the WHO Offices in each project country for the day to day supervision and support for implementation of project activities, provision of policy and technical guidance through National Project Coordinators as well as collaboration with various relevant sectors.

National Malaria Control Programs (NMCPs) lead the execution of the project in each country in collaboration with the health, agriculture and environment sectors as the main actors involved along with stakeholders from urban planning, rural development, local governments etc. Execution of an Integrated Vector Management project like this one requires a multi-sectoral involvement and commitment. A Regional Project Steering Committee (RPSC) composed of experts in the various fields relevant to the project has been established to advise the WHO-AFRO on all technical issues. National Project Steering Committees (NPSCs) composed of sectoral representatives have been established and play advisory and supervisory role.

The National Project Coordinators and the Project Steering Committees (PSCs) work closely together with existing national structures like the Global Fund CCM (Country Coordination Mechanism) to allow full transparency, efficiency, and sustainability even after the project life time.

The Executing Agency has subcontracted International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) in Kenya which is one specialised partner for supporting the development and execution of specific demonstration projects in representative areas in each country. ICIPE works with the national malaria control programs in the development of the demonstration projects based on the latest scientific principles in the field of Integrated Vector Management.

The entire execution of these demonstration projects is within the responsibilities of the national malaria control programs. The national programmes regularly report on progress and expenditure to the Executing Agency. Local NGOs will be subcontracted to cater for the execution of the community involvement related activities and awareness raising in each project countries.

**EA:** Gender mainstreaming  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Gender dimensions have been reflected at both operational - and policy-level interventions for sound chemical management. Vector control efforts in all project countries implementing indoor residual spraying (IRS) have involved women at all levels of the intervention e.g. importation, transportation, storage, usage and disposal. Implementation of demonstration projects has involved women during the entomological and epidemiological surveys to collect baseline data. The actual total numbers of women involved is yet to be reported by countries. The social impact assessments for DDT have involved gender related aspects in five countries.

**EA:** Environmental and social safeguards management  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The project is envisioned to yield significant environmental benefits since it is based on IVM, which is anchored on judicious use and safe management of insecticides and aligned with the DDT Road Map that aim to identify and prove viable, alternatives to DDT, thereby reducing the need for DDT use. Project implementing countries will conduct an inventory with quantification and risk assessment of the current obsolete DDT stockpiles and the development of plans for environmentally sound disposal and adopting the approach to prevent accumulation. The project will establish enabling environments through policy, legal and regulatory frameworks and best practice that minimise the human and environmental risk associated with pesticide use and accumulation.

Efforts to ensure sound management of chemicals, including Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), have important social dimensions. Social factors have an impact on the level and frequency of exposure to toxic chemicals, the kinds of chemicals encountered, and the resulting impacts on human health. For these reasons, during need's assessment and implementation of alternatives intervention to DDT in IRS, the project will pay attention to the socioeconomic and social dimensions, especially women and children, to avoid negative impacts due to the proposed alternatives. In that respect, the project will target women and children in communities for communication and raising awareness about the project activities and benefits. Capacity building will be conducted as a crucial component if the desired impact of IVM is to be harnessed.

**EA: Knowledge activities and products**  
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

During the reporting period, the knowledge management activities were based on exchanges and sharing of experience between country teams in implementing the demonstration projects. This was done during regular reporting via the Executing Agency and at the Regional Steering Committee meeting. Countries used their own systems for recording the baseline and intervention data collected (entomological surveys and insecticide resistance monitoring), as this will aid long term sustainability and official use of these data. However, the project promotes consistency and comparability between data through a single technical support contract with ICIPE in Kenya, which ensures technical experience sharing between the countries.

A communication strategy has been developed to ensure documentation of the interventions being rolled out (e.g. house screening and winter larviciding) and to share these pilots with the public and decision makers.

**EA: Stories to be shared**  
(will be shared with UNEP & GEF communication division)

Two scientific papers have been published in a peer reviewed journal:

Kgoroebutswe TK, Makate N, Fillinger U, Mpho M, Segoea G, Sangoro PO, Mutero CM, Chanda E, Ntebela D, Mogopa M, Mosweunyane T, Nkya TE. Vector control for malaria elimination in Botswana: progress, gaps and opportunities. Malar J. 2020 Aug 26;19(1):301. doi: 10.1186/s12936-020-03375-6.

Nkya TE, Fillinger U, Dlamini M, Sangoro OP, Marubu R, Zulu Z, Chanda E, Mutero CM and Dlamini Q Malaria in Eswatini, 2012–2019: a case study of the elimination effort. Malar J (2021) 20:159 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-021-03699-x>

\*section will be uploaded into the GEF Portal

### 3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target	End of Project Target	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
<b>Objective</b>						
To strengthen national capabilities for implementation and scaling up of evidence-based, innovative, diversified and environmentally sound disease vector control interventions alternative to DDT (with special emphasis on malaria) with multi-stakeholder participation within context of IVM	Quantity of DDT used annually (kg) for malaria control (in Botswana, Mozambique, Namibia; Swaziland, Zambia, Zimbabwe)	About 305 tons of DDT used annually across all project countries.	Year 3: 30 tons of DDT reduced in DDT demo countries Year 4: 50 tons of DDT reduced in demo countries	Year 5: 300 tons of DDT reduced in all countries	Quantitative data on amounts of DDT used between 2010 and 2019 has been collected for all the countries. The consultant recruited for the Social Impact Survey is working with the countries to collect the 2021 DDT data.	MS
	Evidence on effectiveness of large-scale house screening, larviciding and evidence based systematic community education and communication-IEC for malaria vector control documented	Wide spread pyrethroid resistance, and limited IVM options increased the risk of introducing and/or re-introducing DDT in many countries. No well documented evidence, experience and lesson on alternative interventions,.	Outcomes of demo communicated with relevant sectors and streamlined in malaria control strategies	6 demonstration projects completed	In 202/2021 post-intervention data has been collected in 5 countries based on Country-tailored protocols approved by the ethical review committee. Further to the approval of the protocol, Zimbabwe has completed baseline data collection. A no-cost project extension has been approved to ensure a second season's data collection based on existing protocols.	S
	IVM strategy/approach streamlined in malaria programme practices in six (6) countries	Only 1 country reports regularly on amounts of DDT use to the Stockholm Convention secretariat		All 7 countries regularly report on the status use of DDT to the Stockholm Convention secretariat	A UNEP/BRSWebinar on reporting on the production and use of DDT under the StockholmConvention: Questionnaire 2021 took place on 16 June 2021 for all the projectcountries to orient them on the reporting.	S
<b>Outcome 1</b>						
Countries develop and implement integrated cross sectoral policies, strategies and plans and have managerial capacity to fully comply with terms of the SC on the use of DDT for diseases vector control through implementation of IVM		6 out of 7 countries using DDT notified DDT Register	14 countries with improved capacity to implement IVM.	14 countries with improved capacity to implement IVM.	Technical assistance has been provided for the developmentof IVM strategies in Mozambique (16 Nov – 31 Dec2020), Zambia (10 May to 23 June) and Madagascar (24 May to 23 June). Zimbabwehas developed a draft that will be finalized under the auspices of theUSAID/Vector Link Project (Co-finance). The total number of countries with IVMstrategies is now 10 including Botswana, Eswatini, Liberia, Namibia, SouthAfrica and Uganda.	S
	No of countries adopting national IVM strategy					
	No. of countries preparing and sending regular reports to the Stockholm Convention on DDT use and stockpiles	Only 1 country is in full compliance with SC reporting requirements. South Africa & Swaziland regularly report every three years to the SSC	Year 4: all 7 countries using DDT will register and report to the SC (1. Using DDT and notified the DDT Register; 2. Submitting National Reports);		All the 7 countries are collecting 2020 data in preparation for the 2021 reporting to the SC.All the countries are compliant with Stockholm Convention reporting requirements on DDT.	S



Three effective alternative IVM approaches demonstrated in at least 12 sites in 6 countries	No of countries that plan for specific IVM approaches based on the pilot results	All (tier 1) project countries are currently using DDT for malaria vector control. Wide spread high level of pyrethroid resistance, and very high cost of alternative insecticides pose a serious risk of countries reverting back to use of DDT, where pyrethroids are becoming ineffective, meaning DDT use is set to increase.	Year 4: 6 countries designed, implemented and evaluated demo project One regional sensitization workshop for high level decision makers on the outcomes of the project	Year 5: National consensus workshop to revise or incorporate (updating) IVM approaches in malaria and other vector borne diseases strategic document	In the last year (2020-2021), post-intervention datacollection has been conducted. ICIPE has produced the 2020 and the FirstSemister 2021 Technical Reports outlining the progress in each of the sixdemonstartion countries.Ten countries have developed detailed IVM Strategies informed by vector control needs assessments and built requisite capacity for their implementation during the multi-stakeholder consensus meetings.National stakeholder meeting including MOE held as part of the IVM development process in 10 countries including Mozambique (16 Nov – 31 Dec 2020), Zambia 10 May to 23 June) and Madagascar (24 May to 23 June) to faciliate technical capacity building by ICIPE in designing and rolling out IVM approaches.	MS
<b>Outcome 3</b>						
Countries and regional institutions are using guidelines on IVM and social impact assessments to guide and influence policies on DDT use	No. of decision and policy makers surveyed acknowledging that social and health impacts have influenced the decisions made on DDT use at national level	There is little acknowledgement that social and health impacts have influenced national decisions on DDT use.	Year 4: Results of social impact assessments compiled, and shared with decision makers 7 consensus building workshops organized to disseminate social impact assessment results	Year 5: 7 countries have completed survey analysis and compiled reports	All 6 demonstration Countries have developed and approvedquestionnaires and work plans to be implemented in 2021. A consultant has beenengaged to work with the countries to conduct Social Impact assessment surveys.	MS

### 3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs

Output	EA: Expected completion date (as per the latest approved work plan)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2020 (%)	EA: Implementation status as of 30 June 2021 (%)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
<b>Under Comp 1</b>					
Output 1.1: Capacity and systems to notify the SC DDT Register with close MoH/MoE collaboration	2018, Q3	100%	100%	Complete since 2018.Zimbabwe notified DDT use via the SC DDT Register	S
Output 1.2: National IVM strategies developed and regionally harmonized to the Global Vector Control Response	2022 Q2	86%	100%	All the countries earmarked for development of IVM Strategies have accomplished this task including insecticide resistance plans in line with the Global Vector Control Response.	S
Output 1.3: National teams have technical capacity and equipment for entomological monitoring to inform national IVM plans and policies	2019, Q3	86%	100%	Commodities and equipment procured for all and delivered toall countries. WHO and ICIPE have organized and trained teams in 6 counties forentomological data collection.	S
1.4: Training, technical support and provision of equipment to countries to support implementation of evidence based national policies and plans for IVM to a harmonized standard	2019; Q4	90%	100%	Training has been conducted and scaled- up across the countries to inform implementation of national policies and plans. Technical supportmissions provided for 6 countries and entomological equipment has been procuredand delivered.	S
<b>Under Comp 2</b>					
Output 2.1: Maps of vector distribution and resistance compiled for demo sites and regional resistance database updated	2020, Q1	75%	85%	Technical support missions have been minimal (Mozambique) due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Data collection on vector distribution and insecticide resistance in 5 countries except Zimbabwe. Countries are sharing data with ICIPE for reports and publications being drafted by countries. Updating of insecticide resistance data, compilation and finalization of report is planned for 2022 Q1.	MS
Output 2.2: Three effective IVM approaches developed and demonstrated in six countries	2020, Q2	75%	85%	Baseline data has been completed in six countries and data shared with ICIPE for reports and publications. Implementation of winter larviciding and House screening demo interventions are ongoing in respective countries. All larviciding countries (Botswana, Eswatini and Namibia) managed to procure the larvicides and shipped to the counties. Mission ongoing for training on Bti in Botswana and planned for July in Eswatini. Two publications are under preparation for the house screening arm, and three publications are under preparation on the Larviciding arm.	MS
<b>Under Comp 3</b>					

Output 3.1: Updated national and regional manuals and guidelines on IVM	2021, Q2	0%	50%	A draft outline plan of regional technical outreach on project results has been developed with a list of publications and events in order to influence country malaria campaign design for 2022-2025. The final update of national manuals and guidelines on IVM, based on outcomes of the demos, are planned at the end of the project as exit strategy.	MS
Output 3.2: Better understanding of KAP related to malaria and raised awareness of IVM methods among communities and practitioners	2020, Q2	0%	65%	Zimbabwe completed the baseline KAP survey completed in May 2021 and data has been shared with the ICIPE team for processing and analysis. Post-intervention KAP surveys have been completed in Eswatini, Namibia and Zambia and planned in Mozambique and Botswana. ICIPE iteratively developing messages and pictures from surveys. ICIPE still working on modalities on KAP materials development with countries. Routine KAP surveys are part of post-intervention monitoring - will be reported in ICIPE technical report.	MS
Output 3.3: National assessments of social impact of DDT on vulnerable groups	2020, Q2	50%	85%	Only Zambia has conducted a steering committee meeting. The regional consultant to assist the Executing Agency with component 3 has been recruited and is working with the countries. The consultant has held meetings with WR and malaria and environment focal points in all countries. National steering committee meetings are planned. Botswana, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe have confirmed MoE as the national partner to deliver Social Impact Survey. Financial modalities on how funds will be disbursed and utilized have been agreed upon on country by country basis.	MS
Output 3.4: Data on DDT usage and amount/ location of obsolete DDT in project countries	2020, Q2	21%	85%	Initial inventory on the use of DDT and on availability and distribution of obsolete DDT has been completed in 6 countries. The databases on DDT use per year updated with the data up to 2009-2019 use and obsolete quantities already compiled by WHO HQ. As the 2018-2020 data is needed for DDT Questionnaire (Nov deadline) and national SC conventional report, this has been included in consultancy TOR to update.	MS

Table A. Risk-log

Implementation Status 5th										
Risk	Risk affecting:	Risk Rating							Variation respect to last rating	
	Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	MTR	PIR 4	PIR 5	Δ	EA: Justification
1. Increased malaria transmission posed by reduced reliance on DDT or its withdrawal for IRS applications		Moderate					M	M	=	Countries have developed and are implementing IVM strategies that incorporate insecticide resistance management plans to inform the use of effective alternative insecticides and none-insecticide based interventions.
2. Community acceptance of the alternative interventions may not be at the desired level at the beginning of the project as is the case in a number of situations currently with the use of DDT as well		Low					M	L	↓	Project countries have been intensified communication and general awareness including social impact assessment through meetings and conferences.
3. The comparative high prices of alternative insecticides (larvicides) to DDT, as well as some times the high tariffs on imported nets, could undermine the implementation of alternative interventions		Low					L	L	=	Countries are implementing multi-sectoral approaches to malaria vector control in the context of integrated vector management with the view to optimize the use of the minimal available resources and limited arsenal of interventions.
4. Resistance to alternative insecticides that will be used, and the reluctance of some policy makers to move to the use of alternatives are important anticipated risks to project success. The assessments of suitability of alternative interventions may reveal problems associated with adverse climatic conditions or difficulties of funding and retraining.		Low					M	L	↓	Project countries have progressed well with the implementation of the demonstrations on Winter larviciding and House-screening and are collecting requisite financial and technical data to facilitate decision making.
5. Governments in the respective project countries assume that NGOs and CSOs will go against their respective policy with regards to malaria and DDT use and as such they might not support the project.		Low					L	L	=	Project countries awareness creation by establishing multisectoral project steering committees that serve as a platform to raise awareness and reaching consensus on contentious issues regarding the project.
6. Scientific evidence in recent years has demonstrated that increased temperatures due to climate change have resulted in expansion of insect zones. For instance, this has also been witnessed in areas formerly too high and cold for malaria transmission becoming endemic. Climate change can trigger also increase in the risk of other vector borne disease.		Low					L	L	=	Countries have updated and/or developed integrated vector management strategies incorporating an insecticide resistance management plan and aligned with the Global vector control response. In addition to the new class of insecticide, neonicotinoid insecticide Clothianidin for IRS, dual active ingredient bed nets have been introduced with pyrethroid insecticide chlorfenapyr and an insect growth regulator pyriproxyfen. Countries have
7. Lack of new chemical control entering the market or under development.		Moderate					L	L	=	Countries have updated and/or developed integrated vector management strategies incorporating an insecticide resistance management plan and aligned with the Global vector control response. In addition to the new class of insecticide, neonicotinoid insecticide Clothianidin for IRS, dual active ingredient bed nets have been introduced with pyrethroid insecticide chlorfenapyr and an insect growth regulator pyriproxyfen. Countries have developed and are implementing insecticide resistance management plans and have adopted new insecticides that have entered the market as part of their management strategy.
8. Potential for leakage of obsolete DDT stocks and new stocks imported for IRS into the agriculture sector.		Moderate					M	L	↓	Project countries have increased communication and information including impact assessments and multisectoral collaboration
Consolidated project risk		-					M	L	↓	This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.

Table B. Outstanding medium & high risks

List here only risks from Table A above that have a risk rating of **M** or worse in the **current PIR**

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
1. Increased malaria transmission posed by reduced reliance on DDT or its withdrawal for IRS applications	Countries have developed IVM strategies that incorporate insecticide resistance management plans to inform the use of effective alternative insecticides and none-insecticide based interventions.	Countries have been edged to implementing IVM strategies based on locally generated data including insecticide resistance to inform the targeting and deployment of effective alternative insecticides and none-insecticide based interventions.	Countries are encouraged to enhance capacity building on entomology and vector control and strengthen data management systems through the DHIS sytem. Oversight by projectmanager and additional support from National Steering Committees	2021 Q4	WHO, UNEP

**High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.

**Significant Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.

**Medium Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.

**Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that **assumptions** may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only modest risks.