

1- Identification
1.1 Project details

GEF ID	4668	SMA IPMR ID	127469
Project Short Title	Afro II	Grant ID	S1-32GFL-000632 / P1-33GFL-000925
		Umoja WBS	SB-001062.01.04.01
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		
Project Type	Full Sized Project (FSP)	Duration months	Planned 60
Parent Programme if child project			Age 88.0 months
GEF Focal Area(s)	Chemicals and Waste	Completion Date	Planned -original PCA 28-Feb-21
Project Scope	Regional		Revised - Current PCA 30-Jun-23
Region	Africa	Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval	7-Mar-16
Countries	Botswana, Ethiopia, Gambia, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Mozambique, Namibia, Senegal, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe	UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)	14-Mar-16
GEF financing amount	USD 9,550,000	PCA entering into force	24-Jun-16
Co-financing amount	USD 308,218,797	Start of Implementation (Date of 1st Disbursement)*	11-Jul-16
		Date of Inception Workshop, if available	7-9 Nov-2016
Total disbursement as of 30 June	USD 9,203,208	Midterm undertaken?	Yes
Total expenditure as of 30 June	USD 9,450,000	Actual Mid-term Date, if taken	11-Apr-20
		Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken	/
		Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	30-Jun-24
		Expected Financial Closure Date	30-Dec-24

* As per Legal Agreement signed with the EA, project effectiveness is defined as "the date of receipt of first disbursement or sub-allotment".

1.2 EA: Project description

The **project's goal** is to strengthen national capabilities for implementation and scaling up of evidence-based, innovative, diversified and environmentally sound disease vector control interventions (with special emphasis on malaria) with multi-stakeholder participation within context of IVM. The project supports government efforts to introduce and use diversified, evidence based and sustainable vector control interventions and approaches while at the same time support public awareness campaigns and information dissemination to ensure communities engagement. It focuses on civil society and community based organizations to engage communities in implementation of project activities at the grass root level to promote the use of safe and innovative chemical and non-chemical vector control interventions for the control of malaria and other vector borne diseases. This is in line with WHO's recommendations with regards to community education and empowerment in health matters.

The project will include 4 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 to reduce reliance on DDT for diseases vector control and strengthen countries' capacity a better compliance with multi- lateral environmental agreements particularly the Stockholm Convention;

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;

Component 3: Dissemination of knowledge and sharing of experiences to all stakeholders at national, sub regional and regional level in order to influence decision makers.

Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation.

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 Project Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project

Industry and Economy Division,
GEF Chemicals and Waste

Executing Agency(ies)

WHO

Name of co-implementing Agency

Names of Other Project Partners

ICIPE

TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)

Ludovic Bernaudat

EA: Manager/Representative

Benido Impouma

TM: UNEP Task Manager(s)

Jitendra Sharma

EA: Project Manager

Emmanuel Chanda

TM: UNEP Budget/Finance Officer

Anuradha Shenoy

EA: Finance Manager

Abakar El-hadj ABBA

TM: UNEP Support/Assistant

EA: Communications lead, if relevant

2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s)

Chemicals and Pollution Action

TM: UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)

n/a

TM: PoW Indicator(s)

PoW Outcomes: 3A and 3C
PoW Outcome Indicators: i, ii, iii, iv and vi
Direct outcomes to which project contributes: 3.1, 3.5, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.13

EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

EA: Link to relevant SDG Goals

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:

Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere;
 Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages;
 Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all;
 Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable;
 Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns;
 Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts;
 Goal 17: strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.

EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets

Targets 1.1, 1.2 and 1.5
 Target 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3
 Target 6.3
 Targets 11.1 and 11.5; sub-goals 11.a and 11.b
 Target 12.4; sub-goal 12.a
 Target 13.3, and sub-goal 13.b
 Target 17.3, 17.9 and 17.17

TM: GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results

Indicators	Targets - Expected value			Materialised to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
✓ th legislation and policy implemented to control che	7	7	7	7
✓ cal systems implemented, particularly in food produc	6	6	6	6
✓ 6: POPs/Mercury containing materials directly avoid	0	305	305	318
✓ 11: People benefitting from GEF-financed investment	0	9600	9600	12428
✓ 11.1: Male				6128
✓ 11.2: Female				6300

Implementation Status

2023

Final PIR

FY 2023

FY 2022

FY 2021

FY 2020

FY 2019

FY 2018

FY 2017

FY 2016

FY 2015

PIR #	Rating towards outcomes (DO) (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (IP) (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
Final PIR	S	S	L
6th	MS	S	L
5th	MS	MS	L
4th	MS	MS	M
3rd	S	S	L
2nd	S	S	L
1st	MU	MU	M

This is the final reporting period of the project. During the reporting period, the project has completed all the pending activities including the final validation and steering committee meeting of the project.

The six project countries made relatively moderate progress in the collection of data in demonstration sites and adaptation of policy documents. However, project implementation was adversely affected by the Covid-19 pandemic during the one-year reporting period ending 30 June 2022. The pandemic compounded with other challenges resulted in a request for the second no-cost extension of the until 31 December 2022. Despite the constraints, communication, technical assistance, and commitment by project staff and stakeholders had been maintained.

WHO continued to technically support overall project implementation in all six countries, including development of the IVM strategies in the Gambia. ICIPE supported data collection and analysis efforts in six project countries, spearheaded publication of two papers in peer reviewed Journals, and produced information materials in six countries. Quarterly technical project implementation reports and financial reports including co-financing have been submitted by all project countries.

Demonstrations on larviciding in Botswana, Eswatini and Namibia, and House screening in Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe have been completed. All countries collected and analyzed epidemiological and entomological data for demonstrations from the project sites. The project workplan and procurement plans were aligned with the expiry date of 31 December 2022. All countries committed during the final PSC meeting to finalize their final project reports.

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 were finalized by the end of project implementation:

Multisectoral coordination meetings, trainings and technical support; analysis of epidemiological and entomological data; Development of awareness communications, and knowledge product / strategies and materials, conducting social impact assessments, and production of reports on DDT usage.

COMPONENT 1: Technical assistance has been provided for the development of Integrated vector management strategies in The Gambia. All the 13 earmarked Project countries developed the IVM strategies. All countries have completed the DDT questionnaire and submitted to the SSC secretariate. A stakeholders consensus meeting was conducted as part of the IVM development process in the Gambia.

COMPONENT 2: Technical support missions have been provided for Zambia for the documentary on House screening. Implementation of house screening has been completed in Mozambique and Zambia during the period. On Social economic benefits, House screening reduced the loss of labour due to contracting malaria by 1.82 days per adult. House screening increased household income by US\$ 55 per household. Larviciding has been completed in Botswana and Namibia.

Epidemiological findings show that larviciding with Bti resulted in significant decrease in malaria in project countries. For example, in Namibia, larviciding with Bti resulted with a 76.1% reduction of Anopheles larvae and a 74.4% reduction of Culicine larvae. A 76.1% and 74.4% reduction validated the hypothesis reduction estimated at 70% after the application of Bti larvicide followed by IRS. Larviciding with Bti resulted in reduction of Anopheles species caught in different locations, with 89% reduction in adult mosquitoes resting indoors and 75% in mosquitoes outdoors. Three manuscripts were published during the reporting period including; Six decades of malaria vector control in southern Africa: a review of the entomological evidence-base (Malaria Journal, 2022); Anopheles rufiges implicated in malaria transmission both indoors and outdoors alongside Anopheles funestus and Anopheles arabiensis in rural south-east Zambia (Malaria Journal (2023) 22:95).

COMPONENT 3: All project countries finalized Social Impact assessment surveys and compilation of reports based on the developed questionnaires and workplans in all 6 demonstration countries. ICIPE has developed visibility products for the project including; A poster. "AFRO II Malaria Project: Integrated Vector Management (IVM) for Practical and sustainable malaria Control in Southern Africa," and a booklet "AFRO II Malaria Demo Project Booklet 2: Evaluating the feasibility and impact of Winter larviciding and House screening as additional Vector control tools in Southern African countries committed to Malaria elimination, 2017-2022."

Regarding the financial progress, the project has reported 100% expenditure of the execution funds satisfactorily. During the final project steering meeting, the project countries have demonstrated strong interest to work on a follow up project to continue the implementation of the IVM strategies. The terminal evaluation of the project is planned in the second half of 2023 and early 2024.

EA: Summary of status
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

2.4 Co-finance

EA: Planned Co-finance

USD 308,218,797

EA: Actual to date:

USD 597,679,000

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

Following the raising of awareness on significance co-financing reporting, WHO shared a template for co-finance, identifying typical items such as easily accessible total budget and co-finance initiatives for integrated vector management, to be included in quarterly and annual reports. Tier 1 countries have utilized the agreed upon modalities for reporting co-financing (in-kind and actual expenditure) to capture programmatic co-financing (monetary/in-kind) by programme managers through a standardized reporting format and revised their co-finance and have included vector control programme expenditure. The reported co-financing for the Fiscal year 2022-2023 amounted to USD 579,679, 000 either in cash or monetary value of the contribution by the existing and running vector control programs. Both Tier I and Tier II countries have reported on their comprehensive vector control expenditure between 2021 and 2022.

2.5. Stakeholder

EA: Date of project steering committee meeting

5-7 December 2022

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

The Executing Agency, WHO-AFRO has delegated the WHO Offices in each project country to supervise and support day to day 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 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 also 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 lifetime. 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.

2.6. Gender

TM: Does the project have a gender action plan?

No

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 project countries are consolidating data numbers of women involved in project activities. The social impact assessments for DDT have involved gender related aspects in six countries.

7. ESSM

TM: Was the project classified as moderate/high risk at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?

No

TM: If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?**TM:** Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?

No

TM: If yes, please describe the new risks, or changes**TM & EA:** Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period?

No

TM & EA: If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail including

2. **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)

In the last period the knowledge management activities were based on exchanges and sharing of experience between country teams developing the research protocols for the demonstration pilots. 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 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.

Please attach a copy of any products

EA: Main learning during the period

The regional project provided a more credible and assured approach to strengthen collaboration and hearten uptake and implementation of the Stockholm Convention by Member States. The project provided a unique way to tackle and overcome country-specific challenges influenced by various aspects such as diversity of views, political influences, and bureaucratic effects. The regional steering committee meetings served as platforms for experience sharing. The national project steering committees also provides an opportunity various in country partners to contribute to the project implementation and linkage to the one health approach. In the follow on projects, the regional project steering committee meetings should include participants from Agriculture and Infrastructure development sector as observers to strengthen collaboration encourage uptake and integration of integrated vector management into their policies.

EA: Stories to be shared
(section to be shared with communication division/
GEF communication)

Four visibility materials have been developed and one article has been published in a peer-reviewed journal: A poster, a booklet and two peer reviewed manuscripts.

AFRO II Malaria Project: Integrated Vector Management (IVM) for Practical and sustainable malaria Control in Southern Africa.

AFRO II Malaria Demo Project Booklet 2: Evaluating the feasibility and impact of Winter larviciding and House screening as additional Vector control tools in Southern African countries committed to Malaria elimination, 2017-2022.

Nkya TE, Fillinger U, Sangoro OR, Marubu R, Chanda E, Mutero CM. Six decades of malaria vector control in southern Africa: a review of the entomological evidence-base. Malaria Journal, 2022. DOI: 10.1186/s12936-022-04292-6.

Saili K, de Jager C, Sangoro OP, Nkya TE, Masaninga F, Mwenya M, Sinyolo A, Hamainza B, Chanda E, Fillinger U and Mutero CM. Anopheles rufipes implicated in malaria transmission both indoors and outdoors alongside Anopheles funestus and Anopheles arabiensis in rural south-east Zambia. Malaria Journal (2023) 22:95 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-023-04489-3>

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes (Development Objectives)

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
Objective							
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: 305 tons of DDT reduced in all countries	100%	During project implementation, demo countries have reduced total DDT usage by 318.6 tons thereby achieving the project's desired target.	S
	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	100%	Demonstration data has been collected, analyzed and reported in 6 countries (Botswana, Eswatini, Mozambique, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe) based on Country-tailored protocols approved by the ethical review committee.	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	100%	Further to the orientation of the countries on the reporting and use of DDT via a UNEP/BRS Webinar in 2021, the component 3 consultant worked with all the countries to ensure timely submission of reports to the	S
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	No of countries adopting national IVM strategy	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.	100%	Technical assistance was provided for the development of IVM strategies in all earmarked Project countries. Over fourteen countries (Gambia, Botswana, eSwatini, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Mozambique, Namibia, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Niger and Burundi) have developed IVM strategies.	S
	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 7 countries regularly report on the status use of DDT to the Stockholm Convention secretariat	100%	All the 7 countries (Botswana, eSwatini, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe) have collected the data and reported to the Stockholm Convention. All the countries are compliant with Stockholm Convention reporting requirements on DDT.	S

Outcome 2

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 projectOne 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	100%	Thirteen countries have developed detailed IVM Strategies informed by vector control needs assessments and built requisite capacity for their implementation during the multi-stakeholder national consensus meetings. National stakeholder meeting including MOE held as part of the IVM development process in 13 countries to facilitate technical capacity building by ICIPE in designing and rolling out IVM approaches.ICIPE has produced the final Project Technical Report for 2017-2022 outlining the achievements in each of the six demonstration countries.	S
---	--	---	---	--	------	---	---

Outcome 3

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	100%	Social Impact assessment surveys and compilation of reports based on the pre-developed questionnaires and workplans in all 6 demonstration countries has been completed by expert consultant. One Tier I country did not participate in the survey and demonstration project.	S
--	---	---	---	---	------	---	---

For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
Under Comp 1					
Output 1.1: Capacity and systems to notify the SC DDT Register with close MoH/MoE collaboration	2018, Q3	100%	100%	Output indicator target: All (7) countries that are using DDT notify the SSC Progress: All the project countries submitted their reports to the SSC.	S
Output 1.2: National IVM strategies developed and regionally harmonized to the Global Vector Control Response	2022 Q2	100%	100%	Output indicator target: 7 technical mission and one regional workshop convened Progress: Completed All the 13 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	100%	100%	Output indicator target: Needs assessment protocol developed and 6 technical support provided Progress: Completed WHO and ICIPE have organized and trained teams in 6 counties for entomological data collection. Further, 240 Sweep nets, 228 CDC light traps, 288 collection cups, 228 replacement bulbs, 228 Batteries, 72 Automatic battery chargers, 120 mosquito cages, 144 dippers, 12 microscopes, 12 Knapsack motorised blowers, 72 Prokopack samplers, 360 Prokopack collection cups, 120 Prokopack batteries, 72 Prokopack chargers, Commodities and equipment procured for all and delivered to all project countries.	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	100%	100%	Trainings have been conducted and scaled-up across the countries to inform implementation of national policies and plans. Technical support missions provided for 6 countries and entomological equipment has been procured and delivered.	S

Under Comp 2

Output 2.1: Maps of vector distribution and resistance compiled for demo sites and regional resistance database updated	2022, Q4	95%	100%	Output indicator target: Resistance Data collected in 7 countries, Publication of vector distribution maps data compiled, vector distribution publications produced. Progress: Completed Data collection on vector distribution and insecticide resistance in 6 countries has been completed, ICIPE finalized analysis of data and reported the outcomes. The insecticide resistance database has been updated in the Malaria threats map.	S
Output 2.2: Three effective IVM approaches developed and demonstrated in six countries	2020, Q2	100%	100%	Output indicator target: Outcome of demos assessed and documented. Progress: Completed 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 have been completed in respective countries and data shared with ICIPE for reports and publications. Three articles have been published, one submitted for peer review, Five manuscripts are under preparation, including three project end point articles.	S

Under Comp 3

Output 3.1: Updated national and regional manuals and guidelines on IVM	2022, Q4	95%	100%	Output indicator target: Guidance and manuals revised in all 7 countries using outcomes of demo Progress: Completed A total of 13 countries have developed /updated IVM strategies informed by the outcomes of the project. The IVM guidelines/strategies have been aligned with the GVCN to enhance management of Vectorborne diseases in the Region.	S
Output 3.2: Better understanding of KAP related to malaria and raised awareness of IVM methods among communities and practitioners	2022, Q4	95%	100%	Output indicator target: KAP toolkits produced, surveys done. Impact assessment of implementation of outreach programmes done Progress: Completed ICIPE developed Knowledge products on IVM including: Booklets on "Pulling together for Health and Environment: AFRO II Malaria Project" and "AFRO II Malaria Project: Towards Malaria elimination in Southern Africa: Reinforcing Vector Control with House screening and Bio-larvicides." The KAP survey guidelines for vector control to facilitate elimination of DDT use and adopting alternative interventions in the WHO AFRO have been developed.	S
Output 3.3: National assessments of social impact of DDT on vulnerable groups	2020, Q2	100%	100%	Output indicator target: Impact assessment completed in 6 countries and outcomes presented Progress: Completed The regional consultant to assist the Executing Agency with component 3 has coordinated with the project countries and supported the impact assessment of social impacts. All the countries are collaborating with the MoE as the national partner to deliver Social Impact Surveys. The assessment was presented during the final project meeting.	S
Output 3.4: Data on DDT usage and amount/ location of obsolete DDT in project countries	2020, Q2	100%	100%	Output indicator target: Regional report (including 7 tier 1 countries) on the use of DDT and obsolete DDT completed Progress: Completed Initial inventory on the use of DDT and on availability and distribution of obsolete DDT has been completed in 6 countries. A total of 3,395,647kg (3743 tones) of DDT was used and with 658.21kg of obsolete DDT in demo project countries. All countries have compiled the 2018-2020 and submitted the DDT Questionnaire in 2021 to the SC secretariate. WHO report of Global Insecticides use also refers to the DDT use in project countries.	S

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).

4 Risk Rating

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

Please refer to the Risk Help Sheet for more details on rating

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Low : Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
3 Implementation schedule	Low : Project progressing according to original work plan and Adaptive management is practiced and regular monitoring. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
4 Budget	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
5 Financial Management	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
6 Reporting	Low : Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
7 Capacity to deliver	Low : Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.

If any of the risk factors is rated a Moderate or higher, please include it in Table B below

4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

Final PIR

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

Risk	Risk Rating										Variation respect to last rating	
	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	PIR 6	FINAL PIR	Δ	Justification	
1. Increased malaria transmission posed by reduced reliance on DDT or its withdrawal for IRS applications		M				M	M	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 non-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		L				M	L	L	L	=	Project countries have 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	L					L	L	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	L					M	L	L	L	=	Project countries have implemented the demonstrations on Winter larviciding and House-screening and have collected 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.	L					L	L	L	L	=	Project countries have created awareness 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 diseases	L					L	L	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.
7. Lack of new chemical control entering the market or under development.	M					L	L	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.	M					M	L	L	L	=	Project countries have increased communication and information sharing including impact assessments and multisectoral collaboration
9. Difficulties in achieving planned co-financing targets.	Not Applicable							M	L	↓	Project countries were oriented on aspects relevant to collection and compilation of co-financing contributions. The mid term review had recommended removal of the Tier II countries from the overall Co-financing.
Consolidated project risk						L	L	L	L	=	This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.

4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

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

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR 1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period		Additional mitigation measures for the next periods
------	---	--	--	---

WHO

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.

Moderate 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.

Project Minor Amendments

Minor amendments are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines.

Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate.

5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM)

Minor amendments	Changes	Minor amendments
Results framework		
Components and cost		
Institutional and implementation arrangements		
Financial management		
Implementation schedule	Explain in table B	
Executing Entity		
Executing Entity Category		
Minor project objective change		
Safeguards		
Risk analysis		
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%		
Co-financing		
Location of project activity		
Other		

5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)

Version	Type	Signed/ Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	
Original Legal Instrument		24-Jun-16	24-Jun-16	28-Feb-21	
Amendment 1	Extension	19-Dec-20	21-Dec-20	30-Jun-22	
Amendment 2	Extension	22-Jun-20	29-Jun-22	30-Jun-23	

GEO Location Information:

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap \(https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79\)](https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79) or [GeoNames\(http://www.geonames.org/\)](http://www.geonames.org/) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here\(https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx\)](https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx)

Location Name Required field	Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
Zimbabwe					
Triangle, Mufakose A	-17.8675815	30.9250733	Triangle, Harare Zimbabwe (880015)	Mufakose A village, Triangle in Harare	AFRO II Project area
Monyoroka, Chiredzi RDC	-21.05	31.66667			
Namibia					
Okathima Kanangolo	-17.56667	15.38333			
Sikondo	-17.86667	19.63333			
eSwatini					

Malindza	-26.402999	31.770033			
Zambia					
Nyimba	-14.558535	30.819466			
Mkopeka	-14.441361	31.02189			
Botswana					
Robelela	-21.59144	27.985807			
Lepokole	-21.793193	28.35			

To step 5