



FAO-GEF Project Implementation Report

2021 – Revised Template



Period covered: 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2021

1. Basic Project Data

General Information

Region:	Africa
Country (ies):	Malawi
Project Title:	Building climate change resilience in the fisheries sector in Malawi
FAO Project Symbol:	GCP /MLW/053/LDF
GEF ID:	5328
GEF Focal Area(s):	CCA
Project Executing Partners:	Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development
Project Duration:	FSP 5 Years
Project coordinates: (Ctrl+Click here)	-14.687346, 35.260314

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	29 August 2016
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	01 January 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE¹:	31 December 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) ²	
Actual Implementation End Date³:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	5,460,000 USD
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc⁴:	12,120,000 USD

¹ As per FPMIS

² In case of a project extension.

³ Actual date at which project implementation ends - only for projects that have ended.

⁴ This is the total amount of co-financing as included in the CEO document/Project Document.

Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2021 (USD m):	3,013,454 USD
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2021⁵	6,728,276 USD

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee Meeting:	11 th December 2020
Expected Mid-term Review date⁶:	End of the 3 rd quarter 2021
Actual Mid-term review date:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022)⁷:	Yes
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	N/A
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2021 – June 2022):	No
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required⁸	Yes

Ratings

Overall rating of progress towards achieving objectives/ outcomes (cumulative):	MU
Overall implementation progress rating:	MS
Overall risk rating:	Medium

Status

⁵ Please see last section of this report where you are asked to provide updated co-financing estimates. Use the total from this Section and insert here.

⁶ The MTR should take place about halfpoint between EOD and NTE – this is the expected date

⁷ Please note that the FAO GEF Coordination Unit should be contacted six months prior to the expected MTR date

⁸ Please note that the Tracking Tools are required at mid-term and closure for all GEF-4 and GEF-5 projects. Tracking tools are not mandatory for Medium Sized projects = < 2M USD at mid-term, but only at project completion. The new GEF-7 results indicators (core and sub-indicators) will be applied to all projects and programs approved on or after July 1, 2018. Also projects and programs approved from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2018 (GEF-6) must apply core indicators and sub-indicators at mid-term and/or completion

Implementation Status <i>(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):</i>	4 th PIR
--	---------------------

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Institution	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Niklas Mattson, CTA, FAO Representation in Malawi	Niklas.mattson@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Vasco Schmidt, Fisheries Officer, Sub regional Office for Southern Africa	vasco.schmidt@fao.org
Budget Holder	Zhijun Chen, FAO Representative, FAO Representation in Malawi	Zhijun.Chen@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer	Fritjof Boerstler, Technical Officer, FAO Headquarters	Fritjof.boerstler@fao.org

2. Progress Towards Achieving Project Objectives and Outcome (DO)

(All inputs in this section should be cumulative from project start, not annual)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
Objective¹² Improved resilience of fishing communities around Lake Malombe to the effects of climate change	Vulnerability and risk perception index score	1. Extreme	2. High	3 Medium	Extreme	MU
	Disposable income in targeted area due to adaptation measures	0%	10%	20%	0%	MU
	Food consumption Score (FCS)¹³	HH with Poor FCS: 15% HH Borderline FCS: 29% HH Acceptable FCS: 56%	HH acceptable FCS: 65%	HH acceptable FCS: 85%	HH with Poor FCS: 15% HH Borderline FCS: 29% HH Acceptable FCS: 56%	MU
Outcome 1.1: Enhanced	% of key institutions that are using relevant	33%	50%	75%	33% to be updated after a survey	MS

⁹ This is taken from the approved results framework of the project. Please add cells when required in order to use one cell for each indicator and one rating for each indicator.

¹⁰ Some indicators may not identify mid-term targets at the design stage (refer to approved results framework) therefore this column should only be filled when relevant.

¹¹ Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: **Highly Satisfactory (HS)**, **Satisfactory (S)**, **Marginally Satisfactory (MS)**, **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)**, **Unsatisfactory (U)**, and **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)**.

¹² Applicable only for projects with objective level indicators.

¹³ Source of data – baseline survey report

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
information on climate trends, extreme events and resource status, is available and used for the formulation and implementation of effective and timely resilience and management measures.	information required for the formulation and implementation of resilience and management measures					
	% of decision-making, planning and regulatory instruments in the project area, related to climate change resilience in fishing communities that are based on reliable information on the above parameters	No significant incorporation of reliable information	To be reviewed.	All limits on fishing practices and gear - All district and community level development plans and strategies in the project area - All resilience and restoration plans and	Indicator to be reviewed after MTR Based on the reduced project scope from National to Lake Malombe and Upper Shire River, FiRM identified the need to interpret the project document in view of the realities on the ground. Mainstreaming of findings into the national agenda will not be easily achievable by FiRM.	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
				strategies (both aquatic and terrestrial)		
Outcome 2.1: Climate change resilience mainstreamed into key policy and planning instruments of relevance to fisheries and fishing communities	Level of recurrent budget assigned and executed by the district	Spent amount US\$ 46,638.50	25% increase in spent amount	50% increase in spent amount	Spent amount \$65,187 ¹⁴	MS
	Proportion of key policy and planning instruments that adequately reflect climate change as related to fisheries resilience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NCCP and DRMP in draft form - MGDS and NAPA predominantly agriculture-oriented - ASWAp does not make specific reference of climate change issues of relevance to fisheries 	50%	75%	Indicator to be reviewed after MTR Based on the reduced project scope from National to Lake Malombe and Upper Shire River, FiRM identified the need to interpret the project document in view of the realities on the ground. Mainstreaming of findings into the national agenda will not be easily achievable by FiRM.	

¹⁴ Mangochi District Council cost centerwise report

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
Outcome 2.2 Strengthened capacities and awareness of fisheries professionals and other relevant stakeholders to address climate resilience building in fisheries sector	% of targeted institutions applying increased knowledge and awareness in support of resilience measures	15%	25%	50%	20% (to be updated through a survey)	S
	Levels of recurrent budget assigned to and executed by DFO	2017/2018 Spent amount US\$ 20, 798	25% increase in spent amount	50% increase in spent amount	Spent amount \$24,515 ¹⁵	
Outcome 3.1: Adaptive co-management and resource governance systems in support of climate-resilient capture fisheries	Numbers and types of stakeholders considering that they are satisfactorily represented in co-management structures	30% in all major stakeholder groups	50% in all major stakeholder groups	80% in all major stakeholder groups	45% (BVCs only - Through an opinion survey for the 34 newly elected BVCs) to be updated after a survey	MS

¹⁵ Mangochi District Council cost centerwise report

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
Outcome 3.2: Fish stocks and habitats restored through Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) management	% of fishers complying with fishing closed season and gear restriction	27%	40%	80%	50% ¹⁶	MS
	Area excluded from fishing (area set aside for sanctuaries)	80 + 134ha in existing National Park (100m from land)	3,000 ha additional no-take area	6,000 ha additional no-take area	247.2ha ¹⁷ representing 0.59% of Lake Malombe. The targets are at national level	U
	Representation of higher value species (chambo) in catches from Lake Malombe	6.8% by weight	8.2%	10.2%	1.2 % by weight ¹⁸	U
	Catch Per Unit of Effort (CPUE)	Gillnet (kg/100m) = 28.59 Mosquito seine (kg/haul) = 182.29 Nkacha seine (kg/haul) = 654.19	20% increase	3.75kgs/0.1 5h50% increase)	¹⁹ Gears Gillnet Mosquito Net Kandwindwi Nkacha	

¹⁶ District Inspectorate reports

¹⁷ 2018 Report on the biophysical assessment of community managed fish sanctuaries for biodiversity and conservation and productivity

¹⁸ DoF Lake Malombe and Upper Shire catch data

¹⁹ DoF Lake Malombe and Upper Shire catch data

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
Outcome 3.3: Aquaculture is climate-proofed and able to contribute to diverse and resilient livelihood strategies of the most vulnerable sectors of the population		Chambo seine (g/haul) = 37.57			Chambo seine 20.35 FishTrap 115.84 Handline 2757.00	S
	Proportion of kasawala (immature chambo i.e. less than 15 cm) in monitoring catches	2% by weight	20% increase	50% increase	Lake Malombe 0.85% by weight; Upper Shire River 7.4% by weight	
	Number of aquaculture ponds with climate resilience measures in place	10 ponds	15 ponds	30 ponds	28 ponds	
Outcome 3.4: Local people have access to diverse, pro-poor farming systems as a central element of	% of farm households practicing good farm management into diverse portfolio of CC	36%	50%	80% (693 households in the 3 villages around	There are some households which are practicing good farm management but quantification has not been done yet due to Covid-19	MS

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s) ⁹	Baseline level	Mid-term target ¹⁰	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2021	Progress rating ¹¹
resilient rural livelihoods	resilience measures			Kulungwi micro-catchment)		
Outcome 4.1: Project implementation is based on results-based management and application of lessons learned and good practices in current and future interventions	Number and types of reports produced	0	5	10	8 (PIRs and PPRs)	S

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 1.1: Enhanced information on climate trends, extreme events and resource status, is available and used for the formulation and implementation of effective and timely resilience and management measures.	Training of technical personnel to improve analytical skills to sustain routine monitoring of socio-economic and ecological parameters	PM in cooperation with DCCMS and FAO (National Climate Change Expert)	4 th quarter 2021
Outcome 3.1: Adaptive co-management and resource governance systems in support of climate-resilient capture fisheries	Delays in procurement of consultancy services and Covid pandemic. Letter of Agreements have now been finalized and activities are underway	The PMU in cooperation with MCF and LUANAR	Ongoing
Outcome 3.2: Fish stocks and habitats restored through Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) management	Inaccuracy of data due to poorly trained data collectors in the area which is being addressed by upgrading of qualifications for data collectors	PMU, DoF and University of Florida (UOF)	Ongoing
Outcome 3.4: Local people have access to diverse, pro-poor farming systems as a central element of resilient rural livelihoods	Continuous awareness and sensitization meetings where long term benefits of the interventions, problems and solutions should be understood Explore use of incentives to address unwillingness to participate because of land tenure challenges	PMU	Ongoing

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU ratings

3. Progress in Generating Project Outputs (Implementation Progress, IP)
(Please indicate progress achieved during this FY as planned in the Annual Work Plan)

Outputs ²⁰	Expected completion date ²¹	Achievements at each PIR ²²					Implement. Status (Cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance ²³ or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1 st PIR	2 nd PIR	3 rd PIR	4 th PIR	5 th PIR		
Output 1.1.1: Detailed Vulnerability and Disaster Risk Assessments (VDRAs) of Communities around Lake Malombe (BVCs) developed	Year 3, quarter 4	25%	60%	15%	n/a		100%	Vulnerability and Disaster Risk Assessment conducted, the report cleared
Output 1.1.2: Information resources on ecological parameters determining management and resilience options in and around Lake Malombe generated	Year 5, quarter 2	20%	24%	10%	5%		59%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ToRs for a comprehensive fisheries data system assessment developed and reviewed. Awaiting validation with stakeholders (DoF, REFRESH, UoF, FAO SFS, NOAA, academia) on agreed date and medium/platform - “White paper” to help current and potential partners to fully understand the background and issues produced - Preliminary discussions are ongoing with the Geography & Earth Sciences Department at Chancellor College for reconstructing Malombe palaeo-

²⁰ Outputs as described in the project logframe or in any updated project revision. In case of project revision resulted from a mid-term review please modify the output accordingly or leave the cells in blank and add the new outputs in the table explaining the variance in the comments section.

²¹ As per latest work plan (latest project revision); for example: Quarter 1, Year 3 (Q1 y3)

²² Please use the same unity of measures of the project indicators, as much as possible. Please be extremely synthetic (max one or two short sentence with main achievements)

²³ Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

								environment to set baseline for ecological restoration. Possible studies to be funded through a LoA by the project in line with Output 1.1.2
Output 1.1.3. Climate and environmental monitoring and early warning (EWS) systems established	Year 5, quarter 2	25%	40%	5%	10%		80%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community radio stations were assessed to appreciate their capacity in handling EWS, coverage and listenership since use of radios is the most preferred channel for disseminating information around Lake Malombe catchment. Training of community radio stations representatives was also done to enhance their capacity to support dissemination of weather information including severe weather updates. Daily weather forecasts for early morning, tonight and the following day are shared including 5 day weather forecasts. The weather forecasts, warnings and advisories are disseminated using two WhatsApp groups (one for community radio stations representatives and the other for BVC members). The community radio stations further broadcast the messages.
Output 1.1.4. Strengthened fisheries monitoring system	Year 5, quarter 2	30%	41%	10%	0%		81%	<p>Conducted raining for fisheries technical personnel using R analysis tool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Virtual training completed. - Face-to-face training was proposed for October/November 2020 but postponed due to Covid-19 situation in the country. - Monitoring of fish sanctuaries to resume with involvement of Monkebay Fisheries Research Station
Output 1.1.5: Mechanisms for dissemination and use of knowledge in adaptive management developed	Year 5, quarter 2	40%	10%	10%	5%		65%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EAFm audiences were identified and characterized using the EAFm framework. Capacities for information management and use within the targeted audiences were strengthened and the information supply materials and mechanisms were defined, established and strengthened through EAFm training and monitoring and supervision visits by extension workers.

Output 2.1.1: Think tank on Climate Change in the fisheries and aquaculture sector with an integrated vision and incorporating results of Climate Change fisheries monitoring systems established	Year 5, quarter 2	10%	72%	5%	2%	89%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Fisheries and Aquaculture Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (FSTAP) has requested DOF to expand its TORs to include issues of climate change in fisheries. Upon DOF approval the FSTAP mandate will thus encompass FiRM's Objective. FiRM will at that stage approach FSTAP to take on the task corresponding to the "Think Tank" elaborated in the project document.
Output 2.1.2: Relevant policy, legislation and regulatory frameworks reviewed	Year 2, quarter 2	10%	17%	8%	5%	40%	<p>A review of several key policy instruments has been initiated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy briefs on resilience of fishing communities, including impact of climate change - Inconsistencies in nkacha fishing gear specifications within and between fisheries regulatory frameworks i.e. maximum head length, maximum depth re. Fisheries Conservation and Management Regulations (2000); Guidelines for the formation and training of BVCs (2000) - Consolidation of BVC EAFM annual work plans at Traditional Authority level in progress, in preparation for a District level consolidation meeting through which the Management plan for Lake Malombe and Upper Shire River will be formulated.
Output 2.1.3: A policy influencing strategy for mainstreaming climate resilient fisheries and aquaculture	Year 2, quarter 3	0%	15%	10%	10%	35%	<p>A key strategic approach to mainstream fisheries resilience into policy instruments is FiRMs support to the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries management for Inland Fisheries, which is addressing stakeholders from local to central levels, from fishers to law makers. Actions include participatory EAFm training workshops with BVCs as well as preparation of localized training materials and ToT.</p>

developed and implemented.								
Output 2.1.4: Policy guidance materials developed	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	15%	10%	10%		35%	- The EAFm IF initiative comprise transfer of knowledge on fisheries resilience to policy makers at District and National level.
Output 2.1.5: Guidelines /Code of Conduct for responsible CC-resilient aquaculture developments in riparian areas in Malawi	Year 3, quarter 3	0%	40%	10%	5%		55%	- Verification of draft code of conduct was rescheduled due to restrictions on gatherings imposed as a containment and precautionary measure to the spread of corona virus.
Output 2.2.1: Capacity development program for staff of key institutions in relation to CC preparedness and resilience building established	Year 5, quarter 2	8%	20%	12%	10%		50%	Gender gaps identified during Participatory Learning and Action and plans are yet to be developed. Micro assessment for key institutions was done and recommendations for training were made. However, capacity needs assessment is broad and continuous Covid-19 restrictions delayed some activities.
Output 2.2.2: Improved physical capacities for DoF to sustain the resilience strategies	Year 5, quarter 2	28%	50%	12%	5%		95%	- Renovations of fisheries buildings completed. - Patrol vessel tender nearing award
Output 2.2.3: Awareness of fisheries restoration initiatives in southern Lake	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	30%	10%	5%		45%	“Save the chambo” campaign is under preparation

Malawi and Malombe rolled out								
Output 3.1.1: Multi-stakeholder co-management structures established	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	33%	20%	10%		63%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BVC co-management structures were further enhanced through electing sub fisheries association members and linking them with other key co-management stakeholders like chiefs, fishers gear owners and other community based key committees like ADCs. - Transect walks through all BVCs were conducted, problems were identified by all participants, current map vs desired future maps for each BVC were drawn, trend analysis from 1970 to 2020 was conducted and models were drawn on flip charts, activities to overcome challenges were identified and all BVCs formulated annual adaptive EAFm management plans which included financing mechanisms for fisheries co-management.
Output 3.1.2: Participatory resource management plan(s) developed and implemented	Year 5, quarter 2	3%	30%	17%	5%		55%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adaptation of existing fisheries management plans to embrace EAFm concept in progress awaiting outcomes from activities under output 3.1.1
Output 3.1.3: Norms and regulations for resource co-management developed	Year 4, quarter 3	0%	10%	20%	5%		35%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - By-laws will be reviewed and revised following the completion of the management plan
Output 3.1.4: Fisheries Protection mechanisms for	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	30%	30%	5%		65%	

resource co-management								
Output 3.1.5: Transparency and accountability promoted in BVC's	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	30%	10%	10%		50%	- Transparency and accountability training was conducted prior to BVC elections and soon after elections, transparency and accountability was promoted in all BVCs through EAFm training
Output 3.2.1: EAFm training courses for inland fisheries	Year 3 Quarter 4	0%	50%	10%	10%		70%	- A contract with LUANAR titled "Capacity Building for a Participatory Ecosystem Approach to Fishery Management (EAFm) - Inland Fisheries in Malawi" was signed in November 2020 and the inception meeting was conducted. Due to delays the contract was extended to November 2021 at no additional cost. - A LoA is under development for continued support to LFMA's at Lake Malombe and Upper Shire River which will be managed by Mzuzu University.
Output 3.2.2: An ecosystem restoration programme for Lake Malombe	Year 1, quarter 4	5%	33%	7%	5%		50%	- A LoA with University of Florida to support the fisheries restoration and enhancement was signed in early 2020. Due to the covid-19 pandemic activities were postponed and a no-cost extension agreed until November 2021.
Output 3.2.3: A fisheries enhancement program for a healthy Lake Malombe fishery	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	4%	8%	0%		12%	- Actions under this output await outcomes from activities under outputs 3.1.2, 3.2.1 and 3.2.2

Output 3.2.4: Information sharing enhanced among stakeholders including DoF, FISH, Academia, TCP, GEF.	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	15%	15%	0%		30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Actions under this output await outcomes from activities under outputs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2
Output 3.3.1: Aquaculture resilience plan developed implemented and underpinned through on-going research and impact tracking program.	Year 5, quarter 4	0%	40%	20%	15%		75%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducted a dedicated field appraisal of ecological factors for implementation of site specific integrated watershed management interventions as climate proofing measures to enhance base water flow for fish ponds. - Fish harvesting and sampling nets (including scoop and hand nets) procured and distributed to beneficiary fish farmers - Conducted inspection of hatchery operators towards certification for prequalification as potential fingerling suppliers to the project - An aquaculture resilience plan for the localized project catchment (sub-district) from the initial national scope and validation of the same is being mulled over on a case study basis
Output 3.3.2: Potential partners for climate proof aquaculture engaged	Year 4, quarter 4	0%	30%	30%	10%		70%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continued engaging National Aquaculture Centre in Pond based aquaculture as well as Senga Bay Fisheries Research Station in pilot cage culture. - FiRM also engaged LUANAR during development of hatchery inspection criteria and field level inspection of hatcheries towards certification of hatcheries and possible prequalification of the same as potential fingerling suppliers to the project. - FiRM also engaged Subject Matter Specialists (SMSs) for Land Resource Conservation and Crops from the District Agriculture Development Office on IAA.

Output 3.3.3: Action learning & knowledge generation program	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	20%	10%	0%		30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project is still facing challenges in securing a slot for the Aquaculture Extension Workers to acquire knowledge and skills in Farmer Field School methodology through initiatives at Namiasi RTC under PROSPER project
Output 3.3.4: Capacity development program for resilient aquaculture developed	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	0%	40%	5%		45%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Conducted participatory capacity development of 17 community members in cage assembling and installation aimed at creating a locally based community of practice in fish cage development. - Trained 15 community leaders (BVC members and Village Heads) in best cage culture management practices. - Trained 7 Fisheries Extension Workers (5 from District Fisheries Office; 2 from Malawi College of Fisheries) in best cage culture management practices. - Trainings in pond based aquaculture best management practices for both along with fish harvesting and business management are in the pipeline.
Output 3.4.1: Participatory learning and extension programmes & demonstrations such as IAA developed and implemented	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	0%	30%	7%		37%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitated construction of marker ridges and check dams for containment of runoffs hence reduced soil erosion to curb siltation of fish ponds and associated Kulungwi River. - An assessment of five aquaculture ponds was done jointly with Land Resources Conservation and Horticulture Officers. It was recommended to adopt and enhance what is on the group and introduction of appropriate interventions for some sites. Integration of banana and vegetable farming around the fishpond embankment was the common method observed. However, with some banana bunchy top disease noted in some sites, which may require introducing new, and clean banana suckers.
Output 3.4.2: Catchment area management improved	Year 5, quarter 2	5%	15%	15%	5%		40%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Soil and water conservation measures implemented; check dams constructed on gullies, contour marker ridge and ridge re-alignment done. Promoted natural regeneration interventions to enhance management and conservation of forests. Kulungwi riverbank protection through

								management of planted trees under the leadership of Nsauka Village Head. Culprits of charcoal production were caught at Somanje village and this has helped to reduce the frequency of undertaking the destructive activity. Out planting of tree seedlings was done along Kulungwi river banks, farm gardens and in Village Forest Areas (VFAs) as enrichment planting.
Output 3.4.3: Detailed evaluation of fish processing methods conducted	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	0%	50%	10%		60%	- Conducted a field consultation meeting on fish processing methods (deep frying and fish smoking) at Mwalija Fish Landing Station in TA Chimwala, where a need for piloting of Chitofu 3-in-1 (Improved Climate Smart Fish Frying Stove) was agreed by stakeholders.
Output 3.4.4: Utilization of Solar driers & climate smart FTT smoking kilns promoted	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	0%	20%	10%		30%	- Facilitated construction of a demonstration improved climate-smart fish frying stove <i>aka</i> Chitofu 3-in-1 at Mwalija Fish Landing Beach - Collected data on resource use efficiency of the Chitofu-3-in-1 - Solar driers and FTT smoking kilns are not being pursued by the project. The former has been piloted by other donors with rather disappointing results and low acceptance by a range of stakeholders. Both are capital-intensive propositions, and not considered suitable for the dispersed small landing sites and currently low fish landings of the Lake Malombe fishery.

4. Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on Project Implementation

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):

- An assessment of the radio stations capacity in handling early warning systems conducted.
- Training of community radio stations representatives done to enhance their capacity to support dissemination of weather information including severe weather updates as part of the EWS. Community radio stations are broadcasting the weather forecasts, warnings and advisories to the wider community.
- Supported implementation of an Annual Fisheries Frame Survey conducted by the Department of Fisheries, which is a complete census of basic fishing economic units such as fishers, fishing crafts and fishing gears aimed at planning and management of the fisheries. Results of the survey are very important for management of the fisheries resource as it provide trends in fishing effort which are then used for policy realignment and development hence a basis for management decision making.
- A white paper, targeting inconsistencies re. nkacha gear within the Fisheries Conservation and Management Regulations (2000); and between the Regulations (2000) and the Guidelines for the formation and training of BVCs (2000) with proposed amendments for effective fisheries management in preparation
- Orienting Local Fisheries Management Authorities (LFMAs) in EAFm for sustainable fisheries management. 34 Beach Village Committees (BVCs) trained in EAFm
- Orientation of 6 extension workers on EAFm to facilitate development of adaptive and implementable management plans.
- Working with Madina BVC as management authority for pilot cage culture
- Developed local capacity/knowledge through involvement of local artisans and local community members in galvanized iron cage assembling and installation

- Promoting natural regeneration of communal forests for biodiversity protection and enhanced ecosystem services. 10 sites were identified and verified for natural regeneration with almost 37.8 Ha of forests managed and protected. Nearly 3 kilometres of Kulungwi riverbank planted with trees well managed and protected.
- Facilitated construction and tested efficiency of improved climate-smart fish frying stove aka Chitofu 3-in-1 at Mwalija Fish Landing Beach

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?

The National Project Coordinator is, similar to all FAO staff, since the second quarter of 2020 teleworking from his residence in Monkey Bay, some 70 km from Mangochi (in the same District), which is affecting project interactions with Mangochi District officials. The District Fisheries Officer, who works closely with the project, has indicated the need for the NPC to be present when approaching the District, notably the District Agriculture and District Forestry Officers, who are not inclined to acknowledge requests for cooperation from entities at the same administrative level. The project investigated the possibility to supporting commuting by the NPC, but FAO Administration concluded that the distance is too great. Hence, a formal solution to this issue has not been found.

DOF and District entities have rejected several proposed on-line meetings and trainings. This has caused postponements and delays of activities and outputs. Part of the reason may be the lack of allowances for on-line meetings, but there are also issues with connectivity and access to suitable communication equipment. Acceptance of on-line meetings is improving, and if airtime is provided participation is increasingly accepted by DOF.

A District-based Technical Committee (TC) was endorsed by the PSC at the second PSC in Nov. 2019, including draft TOR's, and an inception meeting has been planned since. The TC is potentially very important to the project and for the sustainability of results beyond the project span. However, the Technical Committee members initially declined to meet using on-line means, and hence the meeting was postponed until when covid-19 restrictions have been reduced. During the first quarter the DFO contacted the TC Chair (=the DPD) again, this time to approve a physical meeting. It was initially agreed that the inception meeting should take place in Liwonde over three days, with participants receiving DSA for three night. However, FAO later objected and proposed a two day meeting with one night DSA. This was conveyed to the TC Chair but no response was received. Informally the project was informed that this was due to the change in "logistics". Upon consulting FAO on this, a revised proposal was put forward, for a two day meeting where DSA was replaced with half-board and dinner allowance at a hotel in either Liwonde or Salima. Again, there was no response from the TC Chair. This difficult situation emanates from variance in the interpretation of the donor guidelines on travel and allowances, where other development partners, including some UN organizations, have a less stringent stance, and regularly pay DSA to participants for events within their home-District.

The Vessel Monitoring System (VMS), which was first procured under the TCP/MLW/3504 was due to be handed over to DOF by the end of March 2021. A complicating factor was the malfunctioning of the original devices which remains to be resolved. At the time of writing the remedy is to replace the SIM cards in the tracking devices. Another concern is the lack of a designated entity to receive the VMS. The VMS could ideally be operated by a National Fisheries Inspectorate (NFI), but while there has been talk about forming a NFI for at least a few years, it is yet to materialize. Instead, fisheries patrols are carried out by the “Enforcement unit”, based at Namiasi in Mangochi, who in theory are responsible for fisheries enforcement and conservation in all of Malawi. However, there is very limited operational budget. The Namiasi property is in need of major renovations, and the staff of the unit are generally not capable of managing the VMS. The enforcement unit does not have a dedicated vehicle (an old vehicle is being repaired with support from the project), and the current patrol boat was repaired and relaunched with support from the project. A new patrol boat is being procured, with expected delivery in 2021. The VMS is currently hosted at the Monkey Bay Fisheries Research Station, where there are competent staff and internet connectivity. In future, once formed, the NFI may be based at DOF in Lilongwe, and with sub-offices in each District where there is need for fisheries inspectorate services.

A further issue in relation to the VMS is a lack of legal basis and related fees and penalties. Several of the tracking units installed on fishing vessels were tampered with and in some cases had to be written off. A VMS task force has been formed at DOF to address this and other issues. A proposal for penalties for misuse of the devices was prepared by the task force, but apparently the legal basis to implement these is weak. DOF cites delays with engaging legal experts to put into place needed legislation. The issue of financing the VMS is yet to be conclusively addressed, but presumably this must come from the license fees for commercial fishing units, which therefore needs to be reassessed.

A contract titled “Capacity building for a participatory ecosystem approach to fishery management (EAFm) - inland fisheries in Malawi” was signed with LUANAR in November 2020, which comprised advance payment of 20% of the contract. The payment was processed but for apparently IT-related issues at FAO the payment was delayed until mid-March. Hence the activities did not start in December/January, as expected, and inputs from LUANAR were not deployed as planned in conjunction with other ongoing activities. A no-cost extension of the contract was necessary and processed, with a new end-date in November 2021. Preparation of the contract in cooperation with Procurement started in the second quarter of 2019. Hence it is approaching two years since the tender was initiated. The project is continuously striving to follow up on this and other procurement and payment related processes that are delayed, and while sometimes this helps, there are systemic obstacles and bottlenecks that cannot easily be overcome.

Development Objective (DO) Ratings, Implementation Progress (IP) Ratings and Overall Assessment

Please note that the overall DO and IP ratings should be substantiated by evidence and progress reported in the Section 2 and Section 3 of the PIR. For DO, the ratings and comments should reflect the overall progress of project results.

	FY2021 Development Objective rating²⁴	FY2021 Implementation Progress rating²⁵	Comments/reasons²⁶ justifying the ratings for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	MU	S	<i>The DO rating is Moderately Unsatisfactory since the current NTE means the Development Objective would only partially be achieved. Substantial delays with implementation have occurred, due to the covid-19 pandemic and operational and procurement constraints. No-cost extension currently being considered by the MTR would provide scope for improved DO rating. Implementation Progress is Satisfactory as the Components largely comply with the implementation plan.</i>

²⁴ **Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating** – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet.

For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

²⁵ **Implementation Progress Rating** – Assess the progress of project implementation. For more information on ratings definitions please refer to Annex 1.

²⁶ Please ensure that the ratings are based on evidence

Budget Holder	MS	MU	<p><i>The implementation of the project activities has been relatively slow due to the negative impacts of restrictions imposed since the wake of COVID-19. This has been compounded by a relatively limited engagement of district level authorities in the management of the project, led by expectations that the project cannot fulfil in terms of provision of allowances. The Mid-term evaluation, which was essential to inform revision of the design and scope of the project has been also affected by COVID-19 and will be taking place during the third quarter of 2021.</i></p> <p><i>With the expected results of the MTR available by the end of October 2021, the project needs to complete a No-cost Extension that allows critical activities and outputs to be completed in order to not compromise the overall expected outcomes. It is recommended that the project team, under the close guidance of the Department of Fisheries and with support of the LTO, reformulates the work plan for the project and provide a clear analysis for the implementation and suggest possible timeframes for extension. The revision of the work plan should be factor in adaptation of several activities to the COVID-19 prevailing conditions, exploring innovative way for delivering support in the ground, provide training and facilitate the overall implementation of the project.</i></p> <p><i>Likewise, data management, impact assessment as well as reporting of activities are areas in which the project needs to work in order to reflect better realities from the ground and provide better grounds for analysis of the achievements obtained, bottle necks and possible programmatic recommendations to be considered.</i></p>
GEF Operational Focal Point			Optional Ratings/comments
Lead Technical Officer²⁷	MS	MU	<p><i>The implementation progress was impacted negatively by continued COVID-19 pandemics - activities involving international travel (eg. LoA contract for EAFm) have been severely delayed; trainings were compromised through the online modalities implemented</i></p>

²⁷ The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

FAO-GEF Funding Liaison Officer	MU	MS	<p><i>Although delayed by COVID-19, the project is advancing slowly with the delivery of Outputs (Implementation Progress Rating)</i></p> <p><i>However, at this stage, the evaluation of the development of the objective is not yet clear since the tools for the evaluation of progress (survey) has not been concluded yet. The project should do an effort to conclude the survey and its analysis to report progress on the next reporting period.</i></p>
--	-----------	-----------	--

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

Under the responsibility of the LTO (PMU to draft)

This section of the PIR describes the progress made towards complying with the approved ESM plan, when appropriate. Note that only projects with **moderate** or **high** Environmental and Social Risk, approved from June 2015 should have submitted an ESM plan/table at CEO endorsement. This does not apply to **low** risk projects. Please add recommendations to improve the implementation of the ESM plan, when needed.

Social & Environmental Risk Impacts identified at CEO Endorsement	Expected mitigation measures	Actions taken during this FY	Remaining measures to be taken	Responsibility
ESS 1: Natural Resource Management				
	None			
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats				
	None			
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	None			
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture				
	An environmental impact assessment of proposed pilot restocking of Lake Malombe	None	Carry out EIA before any restocking takes place	PMU, with technical support from University of Florida
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management				
	None			
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement				
	None			
ESS 7: Decent Work				
	None			
ESS 8: Gender Equality				
	None			
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage				
	None			
New ESS risks that have emerged during this FY				

	None		
--	------	--	--

In case the project did not include an ESM Plan at CEO endorsement stage, please indicate if the initial Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid; if not, what is the new classification and explain.

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid ²⁸ . If not, what is the new classification and explain.
	The overall ESS classification is Low Risk, with the exception of a Medium Risk for the restocking component

<i>Please report if any grievance was received as per FAO and GEF ESS policies. If yes, please indicate how it is being/has been addressed.</i>
None received

6. Risks

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
<i>The following table summarizes risks identified in the Project Document and reflects also any new risks identified in the course of project implementation. Please make sure that the table also includes the Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans. The <u>Notes</u> column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, as relevant.</i>

²⁸ **Important:** please note that if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is changing, the ESM Unit should be contacted and an updated Social and Environmental Management Plan addressing new risks should be prepared.

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ³⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
1	Insufficient fisheries sector stakeholder capacities to absorb Climate Change action needs	M	Capacities of stakeholders at Lake Malombe and southeast Lake Malawi have been strengthened under the FISH project	The project has facilitated re-election of BVCs and also initiated training in EAFm for BVC's and IWM stakeholders at Lake Malombe catchment	The rollout of the LoAs to assist community based management and EAFM processes trainings was severely delayed by COVID-19 pandemics.
2	Low pilot level capacities	M	DOF researchers involved in the TCP/MLW/3504 project have strengthened their capacity to carry out research	DOF researchers have been trained in fisheries assessment methods, and also supported in carrying out fisheries surveys and assessments	Online trainings were conducted – this posed challenges as trainees faced difficulties with software installation, operation (requiring a person assisting on site), and internet stability challenges. The positive impact of assessment training was therefore compromised.

²⁹ GEF Risk ratings: Low, Moderate, Substantial or High

³⁰ If a risk mitigation plan had been presented as part of the Environmental and Social management Plan or in previous PIR please report here on progress or results of its implementation. For moderate and high risk projects, please Include a description of the ESMP monitoring activities undertaken in the relevant period".

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ³⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
3	<p>Restoration failures i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Difficulties in regenerating water plants & habitat - Fingerling supply chain problems 	M	<p>Experience from Lake Chiuta indicate substantial potential for natural regeneration of submerged vegetation following enforced moratorium on fishing</p> <p>Supply of fingerlings for restocking would be addressed primarily using the NAC facilities at Domasi/Zomba. Challenges will include establishing a bio secure facility, sourcing of brood stock in the wild, minimizing hatchery selectivity and mitigating lack of reliable electricity.</p> <p>A more critical issue is the lack of sufficiently protected and managed areas where fingerlings could be released. It is likely that once such managed areas are realised, the need for restocking is no longer there, as natural recruitment will take place.</p>	<p>The project is undertaking a certification programme for fingerling supply system to ascertain fingerling quality and build a culture of practice within bio-secure hatcheries.</p> <p>To enhance this, guidelines for implementation of effective biosecurity in fish hatcheries of Malawi were developed awaiting validation. NAC is working towards being bio-secure.</p> <p>Ongoing training in EAFm is aimed at developing consensus for management measures, including to promote natural recruitment</p>	

	Risk	Risk rating ²⁹	Mitigation Actions	Progress on mitigation actions ³⁰	Notes from the Project Task Force
4	<p>Co-management failures i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resistance to implement/enforce agreed to measures - Criminal elements in community 	M	<p>A stronger role of traditional leaders under the new fisheries by-laws will reduce the risk of non-compliance. The institution building that has been carried out under FISH will contribute to increased compliance.</p> <p>The FiRM project will bring support to enforcement equipment and activities, by DOF as well as by local institutions, which would reduce incentive/opportunities for criminal elements</p>	<p>BVCs have been revamped and currently there are ongoing training of BVC's, and realignment of fisheries management plans to EAFm. There is growing support to DOF enforcement, with limited involvement of sub-FAs and BVCs</p> <p>Procurement process for acquiring a patrol boat was re-launched and in final stages before award</p>	

5	<p>Aquaculture failures i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capacity of local partner too low to implement activities successfully - Negative climate impacts 	M	<p>It will be essential to ensure that support to small-scale aquaculture operators is properly assessed for risks and profitability.</p> <p>Aquaculture operators with surplus resources (generally larger scale operators) will have higher capability to adapt to negative climate impacts.</p>	<p>An assessment was conducted to understand the current status of aquaculture where it was observed that there is low input and low technical capacity through poor farmer-extension worker contact hence limited productivity among small scale fish farmers with a yield gap of 44%. As a safety net towards building capacity of existing farmers within the project catchment area to adapt to climate change impacts, key limiting inputs of production such as quality fingerlings and commercial tilapia feeds are being procured. There is also diversification of production systems through piloting of cage culture</p>	<p>The close field support which would be required for pilot operation is at risk to be compromised by COVID-19 pandemics.</p>
---	---	---	--	---	--

Project overall risk rating (Low, Moderate, Substantial or High):

FY2020 rating	FY2021 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2021 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
Moderate	Moderate	

7. Adjustments to Project Strategy – Only for projects that had the Mid-term review (or supervision mission)

If the project had a MTR review or a supervision mission, please report on how the MTR recommendations were implemented as indicated in the Management Response or in the supervision mission report.

MTR or supervision mission recommendations	Measures implemented
Recommendation 1:	
Recommendation 2:	
Recommendation 3:	
Recommendation 4:	

Adjustments to the project strategy.

Please note that changes to outputs, baselines, indicators or targets cannot be made without official approval from PSC and PTF members, including the FLO. These changes will follow the recommendations of the MTR or the supervision mission.

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outputs	No	N/A
Project Indicators/Targets	No	N/A

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, mid-term review, final evaluation or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval, please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes. The Budget Holder may decide, in consultation with the PTF, to request the adjustment of the EOD-NTE in FPMIS to the actual start of operations providing a sound justification.

Change	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project extension	Original NTE: 31 December 2021 Revised NTE: The upcoming MTR will advise on possible project extension.

8. Stakeholders Engagement

Please report on progress, challenges, and outcomes on stakeholder engagement (based on the description of the Stakeholder engagement plan included at CEO Endorsement/Approval (when applicable))

If your project had a stakeholder engagement plan, specify whether any new stakeholders have been identified/engaged:

If a stakeholder engagement plan was not requested for your project at CEO endorsement stage, please

- list all stakeholders engaged in the project
- please indicate if the project works with Civil Society Organizations and/or NGOs
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

Please also indicate if the private sector has been involved in your project and provide the nature of the private sector actors, their role in the project and the way they were involved

Below are the stakeholders the project has consulted. The project has conducted one major event in the reporting period; 3rd Project Steering Committee meeting (PSC; 11th December 2020)

Key stakeholders	PURPOSE			PSC
	Information	Consultation	Participation in decision making	
Department of Fisheries (DoF) (in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security) (national level)		X	X	X
DoF: Mangochi District Fisheries Office		X	X	
Fisheries Association		X	X	X
DoF: Fisheries research stations esp. Monkey Bay and Senga Bay		X	X	X
DoF: Fisheries college in Mangochi		X	X	X
District (Mangochi) governance structures; District Council		X	X	X
Department of Climate Change and Meteorology Services (DCCMS)		X	X	X
REFRESH Project, PACT		X	X	X
Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources		X	X	X
Mzuzu University		X	X	X
NGOs, CBOs (Leadership for Environment and		X	X	X

Key stakeholders	PURPOSE			PSC
	Information	Consultation	Participation in decision making	
Development – LEAD, Council for Non-governmental organizations in Malawi (CONGOMA)				
International expertise e.g. FAO country office, FAO SFS, FIAF, UOF, NOAA-FEDERAL		X	X	X

9. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)
<p>Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment made at formulation or during execution stages? YES</p> <p>Please briefly indicate the gender differences here.</p> <p>Women play a key role in capture fisheries and aquaculture but are often vulnerable to limited access to knowledge, information and training. Fishing is a male dominating sector. For a number of reasons, majority of women in the FiRM project impact area, do not fish, as a results, women face a lot of constraints to access the fish. Some of the problems include; lack of capital, high charges at the market, poor fish market infrastructures, high un affordable wholesale charges of fresh fish on the beach and lack of resources for fish drying facilities which can improve the quality of fish and reduce post-harvest losses especially during rainy season.</p> <p>Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? YES</p> <p>How is the project tracking gender results and impacts?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FiRM project takes into consideration the priorities, opportunities, needs, constraints and knowledge of both women and men, as identified by the gender analysis. - FiRM project includes activities and outputs that address, gender inequalities and aim at ensuring that women and men benefit equally from the intervention (Focus on: equal access to productive resources and services: equal opportunity to influence decision-making: equal possibility to access and benefit from economic opportunities: and equal distribution of work burden). - The project tracks gender norms that are improved through gender transformative approaches such as gender division of labor, access to and control of resources, participation and decision making among the local fisheries management authorities.

- FIRM project ensures that all indicators are gender disaggregated in order to track:
 - Number of male and female Local Fisheries Management Authorities with access to extension services
 - Number of male and female Local Fisheries Management Authorities with access to market information and related services
 - Technical working group in place to monitor gender related impacts
 - Number of men and women with access to labour saving technologies and practices
 - Perceptions of men and women of their access to services and infrastructure
 - Availability of funds to address gender issues

Does the project staff have gender expertise? **YES**

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

- closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources.
- improving women's participation and decision making; and or
- generating socio-economic benefits or services for women

The table below highlights gender differences in the fish value chain in Lake Malombe and Upper Shire River

Function in the value chain	Location	Role in the System	Approx. % of women
Fishers	Fishing	Crew members deciding where to fish	0%
	Fishing unit owner	Gear owner (Finance, fuel and maintenance)	1-5%
	Landing site	Selling of fresh fish	1-5%
Local brokers	Fish processing sites	Carriers (Mostly women and children)	70%
		Buyers (Men and Women)	60%
		Fish mongers (Cheu cheu) mostly men	1-5%
	Storage and packaging(In cartons, bags and baskets)	Local Fish processing (Owners & Assistants)	70%
Fish processing using improved technology (Owners & Assistants)		1-5%	
Local processors	Fish processing (Beach or village)	Transportation to markets (Owners & Assistants), mostly women and youth	70%
Marketing intermediaries, Retail/Wholesale traders	Marketing towns	Transportation (Drivers and assistants/ Loaders)	1-5%
	Fish markets	Fish trader and middle men	3%
		Wholesaler	1-5%
		Retailer	30%
Marketing points	Consumers	35%	

The Project has a Socioeconomic Gender and Governance Officer who works hand in hand with the FAO Malawi Gender Focal persons at the Country Office, Department of Fisheries Gender Unit, Gender and community development offices and a Mangochi District Gender Technical Working Group. The FAO gender team is also in good collaboration and Coordination with other UN Agencies and intend to share experiences and plans in Joint Gender Transformative Approaches.

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

FIRM Project is expected to mainstream Gender in all project activities to prevent the project from being gender blind and build capacity of the fishing communities and the catchment area through provision of trainings in order to close Gender Gaps in access to and control over natural resources.

Improving women’s participation and decision making;

The Firm project is expected to raise awareness in Education and sensitization programs on gender and women empowerment

Generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

The project is expected to increase involvement of Men and Women in Fisheries Governance. Fishing communities are organized into beach village committees (BVC). BVC are a local fisheries management authority (LFMA) that oversees fisheries management at the local level. The BVCs are responsible for monitoring and enforcing national as well as locally established fisheries bylaws. There are also Fisheries Associations (FA), which are higher order LFMAs, a cluster of BVCs, that oversee operations of several BVCs that share the same ecosystem which is water body based. These organizations are important players in participatory fisheries management as they represent the interests of local stakeholders and the FA and BVC sub-committees are supposed to include 30% women. FIRM project encourages women to be active in socio-economic activities of BVCs.

10. Knowledge Management Activities

Knowledge activities / products (when applicable), as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement / Approval

- Does the project have a knowledge management strategy? If not, how does the project collect and document good practices? Please list relevant good practices that can be learned and shared from the project thus far.
- Does the project have a communication strategy? Please provide a brief overview of the communications successes and challenges this year.
- Please share a human-interest story from your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people’s livelihoods while contributing to achieving the expected global environmental benefits. Include at least one beneficiary quote and perspective, and please also include related photos and photo credits.
- Please provide links to publications, leaflets, video materials, related website, newsletters, or other communications assets published on the web.
- Does the project have a communication and/or knowledge management focal point? If yes, please provide their names and email addresses

TECHNICAL REPORTS

Report on the technical consultation to update the work plan of GCP/MLW/053/LDF, Liwonde 30 November – 1 December 2017. GEF/FAO project “Building climate change resilience in the fisheries sector in Malawi” GCP /MLW/053/LDF. Mangochi, Malawi. FIRM Technical Report No. 1.

Inception Workshop of the project “Building Climate Change Resilience in the fisheries sector in Malawi”. Mangochi, Malawi, 30th January 2018 – 1st February, 2018. GEF/FAO project “Building climate change resilience in the fisheries sector in Malawi” (FIRM) GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FIRM Technical Report No. 2.

Kamtambe K., Kaphuka B., Banda J. and Msiska O. (2018). A study of the Benthos of Lake Malombe, Malawi, 2017. FAO Projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No.3.

Balaka Y., Chagoma H., Phiri T.B. and Msiska O. (2018). The limnology of Lake Malombe, 2017. FAO Projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 4.

Singini W. (2018). Lake Malombe Fisheries Value Chain Analysis. FAO projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 5.

FISH NODE, LUANAR (2018). Technical Assistance to fisheries management and aquaculture communities surrounding Lake Malombe. FAO projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 6.

Hecht T. (2018a). Final assignment report and recommendations (Consultancy on Environmental Impact Assessment and Aquaculture). FAO projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 7.

Hecht T. (2018b). Feasibility of restocking Lake Malombe with hatchery reared Chambo. FAO projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 8.

Hecht T. (2018c). An assessment of impacts of “protection” and “production” artificial reefs with recommendations for Lake Malombe. FAO projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 9.

Hecht T. (2018d). The feasibility of cage aquaculture in Lake Malombe. FAO projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 10.

Hecht T. (2018e). A practical protocol for establishing aquaculture development zones for cage aquaculture in Lake Malawi. FAO projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 11.

Hecht T. (2018f). Environmental monitoring and management plan for cage aquaculture in Lake Malawi. FAO projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 12.

Hecht T. (2018g). Approaches to modelling aquaculture Carrying Capacity in Lake Malawi. FAO projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 13.

Chigona G. and Msiska O. (2018). Report of the bathymetric survey of Lake Malombe. FAO projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 14.

Msiska, O. (Ed.) (2018). Fisheries assessment studies of Lake Malombe, 2017. FAO projects TCP/MLW/3504 and GCP /MLW/053/LDF. FiRM Technical Report No. 15.

Report on Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) installation training, Monkeybay, 24th to 26th April 2018. FiRM Technical Report No. 16

Report on Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) Operation training, Salima, 12th to 14th June 2018. FiRM Technical Report No. 17

Bathymetry survey 2019. Report No. 18

Beach Village Committees Self-financing Mechanisms. Report No. 19

Technical and Physical Capacity Needs Assessment for National Aquaculture Centre (NAC). Report No 20

Fishers Awareness meeting for authentic fishing gears. Report No. 21

Awareness and consultation meeting with upstream community on Integrated Watershed Management interventions for Kulungwi micro – catchment. Report No 22 Strategic planning meeting with key stakeholders on Integrated Watershed Management interventions within Kulungwi river micro-catchment. Report No. 23

The status of existing rainfall stations and assessment of proposed new sites Report No. 24

Baseline study Report No. 25

Vulnerability and Disaster Risk Assessment Report No. 26

Lake Malombe Fish Biomass Fluctuation: Ecosystem and Human Health Impacts and Fisherfolks' Adaptation Strategies- accepted Egyptian Journal of Aquatic Sciences-Elservier

Lake Malombe Ecological dynamics-accepted Freshwater ecology- Tylor & Francis

LULC vs ESV- Environmental monitoring and assessment-Springer

Ecosystem valuation -African Journal of Ecology-Wiley

LULCD, trade-offs& implication-sustainable environment

Lake Malombe fishing communities' livelihood, vulnerability, and adaptation strategies <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crsust.2021.100055>

Modeling of Lake Malombe Annual Fish Landings and Catch per Unit Effort (CPUE) <https://doi.org/10.3390/forecast3010004>

EAFM TRAINING MATERIALS AND VIDEO LINKS

1. Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Training Course (Inland Fisheries). Volume 1: Handbook for Trainees
2. Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Training Course (Inland Fisheries). Volume 2: Inland Fishery Case Studies
3. Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Training Course (Inland Fisheries). Volume 3: Training Course Presentations and Visuals
4. Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management Training Course (Inland Fisheries). Volume 4: Training Session Plans

EAFm Video Links.

Friday Njaya; National Project Director
<https://youtu.be/pty-xqo2CdU>

Emmanuel Kaunda; Fish Node – LUANAR
<https://youtu.be/Wg9AkEBidHI>

Dalitso Kafumbata; Research Advisor- FiRM
<https://youtu.be/CEhBK9pbvq4>

Monica Kagwira; Fisheries Inspectorate Officer
<https://youtu.be/sHFweGPbmhg>

Faith Teleka; Socioeconomics, Gender & Governance Advisor - FiRM
https://youtu.be/lcuO9QLT_F0

Geoffrey Kanyerere; Snr. Deputy Director of Fisheries
<https://youtu.be/2lpBpNdOB4A>

PROJECT PROGRESS REPORTS

Project Progress Report No. 1. 9 November 2016-31 December 2016

Project Progress Report No. 2. 1 January -30 June 2017

Project Progress Report No. 3. 1 July-31 December 2017

Project Progress Report No. 4. 1 January-30 June 2018

Project Progress Report No.5 July-31 December 2018

Project Progress Report No. 6 July – 31 December 2019

Project Progress Report No. 7 July – 31 December 2020

Project Implementation Review, 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018

Project Implementation Review, 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019

Project Implementation Review, 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020

PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE REPORTS

First Project Steering Committee Meeting - GCP/MLW/053/LDF. Lilongwe, 25 May 2018

Second Project Steering Committee Meeting – GCP/MLW/053/LDF. Lilongwe 29 November 2019

Third Project Steering Committee Meeting – GCP/MLW/053/LDF. Lilongwe 11 December 2020

OTHER DOCUMENTS

Visibility and Communication Strategy for 2017-2021.

11. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

Are Indigenous Peoples involved in the project? How? Please briefly explain.

If applies, please describe the process and current status of on-going/completed, legitimate consultations to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) with the indigenous communities

Do indigenous peoples have an active participation in the project activities? How?

None Identified

12. Innovative Approaches

Please provide a brief description of an innovative³¹ approach in the project / programme, describe the type (e.g. technological, financial, institutional, policy, business model) and explain why it stands out as an innovation.

Facilitated construction of a demonstration improved climate-smart fish frying stove aka Chitofu 3-in-1 at Mwalija Fish Landing Beach

Data was collected on resource use efficiency of the Chitofu-3-in-1 with preliminary results showing that:

- Chitofu 3-in-1 stove potentially saves fuelwood by 70%
- Chitofu 3-in-1 stove has higher product quality than traditional stoves and consumers prefer Chitofu 3-in-1 products.
- Investment on a Chitofu 3-in-1 stove has a 95% probability of being profitable as products have high potential of fetching double prices than those in local markets due to their superior sensory characteristics. For example, the price of Utaka in local markets was MK2300 (~US\$3) compared with MK4500 (~US\$6) for Chitofu 3-in-1 products.
- Chitofu 3-in-1 stove reduced drudgery of work by over 78% for processors because the stove processes twice the quantity of fish and half the amount of time to process a batch (between 40-50 minutes) as opposed to 3-4 hours in the traditional stove.
- There is 82% probability that fish processors will be willing to pay for Chitofu 3-in-1.

13. Possible impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project

Please indicate any implication of the Covid-19 pandemic on the activities and progress of the project. Highlight the adaptative measures taken to continue with the project implementation.

- Are the outcomes/outputs still achievable within the project period.
- Will the timing of the project MTR or TE be affected/delayed?
- What is the impact of COVID-19 on project beneficiaries, personnel, etc.
- Are there good practices and lessons learned to be shared?

Covid-19 contributed to delays in project implementation, and also delayed the MTR. The Outcomes are generally not achievable within the current project period. The need for a no-cost extension has been identified.

³¹ Innovation is defined as *doing something new or different in a specific context that adds value*

14. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing ³²	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval	Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2021	Actual Amount Materialized at Midterm or closure (confirmed by the review/evaluation team)	Expected total disbursement by the end of the project
Government	DOF	In kind	1 500 000	745,086		1 500 000
Government	DCCMS	In kind	300 000	98,140		300 000
Government	MoAIWD	In kind	1 500 000	363,611		1 500 000
Bilateral aid agency	FISH	Grant	5 500 000	4,134,721		5 500 000
GEF Agency	FAO	In kind	100 000	193,267.64		100 000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	470 000	436,993		470 000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	2 000 000	293,897		2 000 000
CSO	LUANAR	In kind	750 000	462,560		750 000
		TOTAL	12,120,000	6,728,276		12,120,000

Please explain any significant changes in project co-financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement

³² Sources of Co-financing may include: Bilateral Aid Agency(ies), Foundation, GEF Agency, Local Government, National Government, Civil Society Organization, Other Multi-lateral Agency(ies), Private Sector, Beneficiaries, Other.

Annex 1. – GEF Performance Ratings Definitions

Development/Global Environment Objectives Rating – Assess how well the project is meeting its development objective/s or the global environment objective/s it set out to meet. **DO Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** - Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”); **Satisfactory (S)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings); **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** - Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits); **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** - Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives); **Unsatisfactory (U)** - Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits); **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** - The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.)

Implementation Progress Rating – Assess the progress of project implementation. **IP Ratings definitions:** **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be resented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.