FAO-GEF Project Implementation Review

2019 – Revised Template

Period covered: 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019

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

Milestone Dates:

GEF CEO Endorsement Date:	10 March 2014
Project Implementation Start Date/EOD :	1 January 2017
Proposed Project Implementation End Date/NTE[1]:	31 December 2021
Revised project implementation end date (if applicable) [2]	N/A
Actual Implementation End Date[3]:	N/A

Funding

GEF Grant Amount (USD):	5,460,000 USD
Total Co-financing amount as included in GEF CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc[4]:	12,120,000 USD
Total GEF grant disbursement as of June 30, 2019 (USD m):	1,092,028 USD
Total estimated co-financing materialized as of June 30, 2019[5]	**5,647,449.64**

[1] as per FPMIS

[2] In case of a project extension.

[3] Actual date at which project implementation ends/closes operationally -- only for projects that have ended.

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

Review and Evaluation

Date of Most Recent Project Steering Committee:	25 May 2018[6]
Mid-term Review or Evaluation Date planned (if applicable):	2020 1st quarter
Mid-term review/evaluation actual:	N/A
Mid-term review or evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	**Yes**
Terminal evaluation due in coming fiscal year (July 2019 – June 2020).	**No**
Terminal Evaluation Date Actual:	N/A
Tracking tools/ Core indicators required[7]	**YES**

Ratings

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

Status

Implementation Status ***(1st PIR, 2nd PIR, etc. Final PIR):***	2nd PIR

[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] Second Project Steering Committed will be held on 10th July 2019

[7] 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

Project Contacts

Contact	Name, Title, Division/Affiliation	E-mail
Project Manager / Coordinator	Niklas Mattson	Niklas.Mattson@fao.org
Lead Technical Officer	Vasco Schmidt Simon Funge-Smith	vasco.schmidt@fao.org Simon.FungeSmith@fao.org
Budget Holder	Zhijun Chen	Zhijun.Chen@fao.org
GEF Funding Liaison Officer, Investment Centre Division	Fritjof Boerstler	Fritjof.boerstler@fao.org

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[8]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[9]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating [10]
Objective[11] 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	N/A	**N/A**
	Disposable income in targeted area due to adaptation measures	0%	10%	20%	Currently working with Telekom Networks Malawi (TNM) to access credit usage as a representation of disposable income	**S**
	Food consumption Score (FCS)	HH with Poor FCS: 15% HH Borderline FCS: 29% HH Acceptable FCS: 56%	HH acceptable FCS: 65%	HH acceptable FCS: 85%	N/A	**N/A**
Outcome 1.1: Enhanced information on climate trends, extreme events and resource status, is	% of key actors that are using relevant information required for the formulation and	33%	50%	75%	33 percent of the households are using information required for the formulation and implementation of resilience and management measures	**S**

[8] 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.

[9] 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.

[10] 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).

[11]Applicable only for projects with objective level indicators.

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[8]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[9]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating [10]
available and used for the formulation and implementation of effective and timely resilience and management measures.	implementation of resilience and management measures					
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	2018/2019 Approved amount US$ 73,506.64 Disbursed amount US$ 43,457.94 Spent amount US$ 46,638.50	50%	75%	2018/2019 approved 16.14% Disbursed 7.82% Spent 6.04%	**S**
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%	**S**
	Levels of recurrent budget assigned to and executed by DFO	2017/2018 Approved amount US$21,490 Disbursed amount	15% increase in approved amount	30% increase in approved amount	2018/2019 approved amount US15,346 Disbursed (June, 2019) US$13,507	**S**

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[8]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[9]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating [10]
		US$ 20, 798 Spent amount US$ 20, 798	20% increase in disbursed amount 25% increase in spent amount	40% increase in disbursed amount 50% increase in spent amount	Spent (June 2019) US$13, 507	
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	30% The project inherited co-management structures from FISH Project (USAID –PACT) whose tenure of office is yet to expire	S
	% of fishers complying with norms and regulations for resource co-management	27%	40%	80%	27% compliance with norms and regulations	**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	BVCs and Sub FAs are managing protected areas to enhance their contribution to fish breeding, nursing and recruitment	**S**

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[8]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[9]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating [10]
Outcome 3.2: Fish stocks and habitats restored through Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) management	Representation of higher value species (chambo) in catches from Lake Malombe	2% by weight	5%	9%	Fishery independent surveys to take place before and after 2019 fishing closed season to come up with progress.	**S**
	Catch Per Unit of Effort (CPU)	2.5kgs/0.15hrs	3kgs/0.15 hr (20% increase)	3.75kgs/0.15hrs (50% increase)	Fishery independent surveys to take place before and after 2019 fishing closed season to come up with progress	**S**
	Proportion of kasawala (immature chambo i.e. less than 15 cm) in monitoring catches	2% by weight	20%	50%	Fishery independent surveys to take place before and after 2019 fishing closed season to come up with progress	**S**
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	Number of aquaculture ponds with climate resilience measures in place	10 ponds	30 ponds	60 ponds	18 fish ponds applying climate resilience measures (deep pond technology) Conducted feasibility survey of 35 pond sites to identify potential fish ponds for application of climate proof technologies	**S**
Outcome 3.4: Local people have access to diverse, pro-poor farming systems as a central	% of farms households practicing good farm management into diverse portfolio of CC	36%	50%	80%	36% of farm households are practicing good farm management	**MS**

2. Progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes (cumulative)

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator(s)[8]	Baseline level	Mid-term target[9]	End-of-project target	Level at 30 June 2019	Progress rating [10]
element of resilient rural livelihoods	resilience measures					

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating [12]

[12] To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

Action plan to address MS, MU, U and HU rating [13]

Outcome	Action(s) to be taken	By whom?	By when?
Outcome 3.1: Adaptive co-management and resource governance systems in support of climate-resilient capture fisheries	- Revamp existing Local Fisheries Management Authorities (LFMA) - Develop resource management implementation plan with LFMAs	- Socio Economist, Gender and Governance Specialist	3rd and 4th quarter of 2019
Outcome 3.4: Local people have access to diverse, pro-poor farming systems as a central element of resilient rural livelihoods	- Establish learning centres for IAA - Conduct study tours for capacity building for local farmers on Integrated Watershed Management and Integrated Agriculture Aquaculture - Facilitate adoption IAA and IWM - Improve existing fish processing methods - Facilitate adoption of deep pond technology and small scale cage farming in Upper Shire	- Aquaculture Specialist - Climate Change and Natural Resources Specialist	3rd and 4th quarter of 2019

[13] To be completed by Budget Holder and the Lead Technical Officer

2. Progress in Generating Project Outputs

Outputs[14]	Expected completion date [15]	Achievements at each PIR[16]					Implement. status (cumulative)	Comments. Describe any variance[17] or any challenge in delivering outputs
		1st PIR	2nd PIR	3rd PIR	4th PIR	5th 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 %*				85%	- Data collection on specified areas was conducted in order to supplement the existing Participatory Vulnerability and Climate Change Assessment. The VDRA draft report to be ready end June 2019
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 %	*25 %*				45%	- The project is cooperating with the development of an innovative GIS-based system that can map different types of environmental and human pressure on fisheries. This may allow the identification of higher risk or vulnerable fishery areas and their communities.
Output 1.1.3. Climate and environmental monitoring and early warning (EWS) systems established	Year 5, quarter 2	25 %	40 %				65%	- A WhatsApp group was created as a way of rolling out the early warning systems. Intended key participants are Beach Village Committee and Sub Fisheries Association Members - Assessment of rainfall monitoring stations done. This involved Assessment of existing rainfall stations in three Traditional Authorities in Mangochi and proposed new sites for additional

[14] 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.

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

[16] 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)

[17] Variance refers to the difference between the expected and actual progress at the time of reporting.

								rainfall station in the three Traditional Authorities in Mangochi - A coordination meeting between DCCMS, DoF and FiRM PMU was conducted to strategize on EWS for fisher-men and production of district specific weather updates targeting communities around Lake Malombe and Upper Shire.
Output 1.1.4. Strengthened fisheries monitoring system	Year 5, quarter 2	30 %	41 %				71%	- The procurement of a patrol vessel for southern Lake Malawi has been initiated. - An existing patrol vessel was repaired, intended for use on Lake Malombe. - A Vessel Monitoring System was rolled out, procurement of tracking devices (as part of TCP/MLW/3504) and provision of training for installation technicians and inspectors for system operation was done.
Output 1.1.5: Mechanisms for dissemination and use of knowledge in adaptive management developed	Year 5, quarter 2	40 %	10 %				50%	- A communication strategy was prepared - Primary target audiences identified such as BVCs, Sub-FAs, DFO and DOF researchers
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 %				82%	- After a number of meetings with Department of Fisheries and other stakeholders, it was agreed that there was no need to form the 'Think Tank' because another body known as FSTAP already exists within the Department of Fisheries which also deals with scientific advisory issues. The project was advised to make full use of the annual National Fisheries and Aquaculture Forum, where climate related and other issues will be addressed.
Output 2.1.2: Relevant policy, legislation and regulatory frameworks reviewed	Year 2, quarter 2	10 %	17 %				27%	- Key policy instruments have been identified (Table 1). These are to be reviewed and will guide project priorities to address gaps in existing policies.
Output 2.1.3: A policy influencing strategy for	Year 2,	0%	15				15%	- Preliminary consultations have been undertaken and these point to the need for broader consultations through meetings and workshops.

mainstreaming climate resilient fisheries and aquaculture developed and implemented.	quarter 3		%					Activities have been planned for the next reporting period
Output 2.1.4: Policy guidance materials developed	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	15 %				15%	- In line with the above Output, activities will be prepared to develop and disseminate policy guidance materials.
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 %				40%	- Draft guidelines to be ready September 2019
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 %				28%	- FiRM is preparing to carry out a Capacity Building Needs Assessment for key institutions. PMU staff will implement the CBNA at the local level (including Sub-FAs and BVC), while a consultancy is considered for the District and National levels
Output 2.2.2: Improved physical capacities for DoF to sustain the resilience strategies	Year 5, quarter 2	28 %	50 %				78%	- Bills of Quantities for upgrade of DOF building in Mangochi were drafted by the Mangochi District Public Works Department, and subsequently reviewed and adjusted by an engineer. Tender is being prepared. - District fisheries extension staff lack transport, and FiRM has procured 5 motorbikes which have been deployed - A DOF double cab pickup was renovated and transferred to Mangochi for use by FiRM and the District Fisheries Office - A new patrol vessel is being procured. The first tender failed, and a new tender is being issued.
Output 2.2.3: Awareness of	Year 5,	0%	30				30%	- A planning meeting with the DFO have been done and target

fisheries restoration initiatives in southern Lake Malawi and Malombe rolled out	quarter 2		%					audience for awareness messages has been defined. This has been done in collaboration with Communications Officers from FAO Malawi
Output 3.1.1: Multi-stakeholder co-management structures established	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	33 %				33%	- FiRM in close cooperation with the DFO are initiating actions to facilitate the BVCs and RVCs to develop annual, adaptive and implementable management plans. Importantly, this will include ways to self-finance management activities. Further, special attention will be given to the important roles played by Traditional Authorities, Group Village Chiefs and Village Chiefs.
Output 3.1.2: Participatory resource management plan(s) developed and implemented	Year 5, quarter 2	3%	30 %				33%	
Output 3.1.3: Norms and regulations for resource co-management developed	Year 4, quarter 3	0%	10 %				10%	- With resources from FiRM, the District Fisheries Officer, Traditional Authorities, Sub-Fisheries Association members (who are also chairs of Beach Village Committees) carried out verification of gears in use at Lake Malombe. The verification was carried out on land and on water. The main interest was the Nkacha gear, which has seen a significant technological drift since its introduction, and no longer matches the original specifications. - Options to address the Nkacha ger include a total ban, or simply enforcing original gear regulations
Output 3.1.4: Fisheries Protection mechanisms for resource co-management	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	50 %				50%	- The Chitetezo Fisheries patrol vessel was successfully upgraded and is based at the DFO office in Mangochi. It is used primarily for enforcement activities in Lake Malombe and in fishing Area A of Lake Malawi (also see Output 2.2.2). - A training for boat drivers was carried out, including 10 fisheries protection officers. These officers will be responsible for operations using the Chitetezo as well as the new patrol vessel. - The Government, effective 1st January approved vessel Monitoring

								System for commercial and semi-commercial stern and pair trawlers on Lake Malawi. Installation of tracking devices already started and 38 stern and par trawler units have been installed. Additional tracking devices will be required and DOF is preparing a formal request.
Output 3.1.5: Transparency and accountability promoted in BVC's	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	30 %				30%	- Orientation meetings have been held with BVCs and local leaders and training workshops are on-going.
Output 3.2.1: An EAF training course for inland fisheries	Year 3 Quarter 4	0%	50 %				50%	- Ecosystems Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFm) training was conducted
Output 3.2.2: A verified and updated restoration plan for Lake Malombe, including risk assessment developed	Year 1, quarter 4	5%	33 %				38%	- Literature review is underway, to document restoration initiatives around Lake Malombe which will guide production of the draft plan for the Lake to be validated by DoF, academia and other key relevant stakeholders working in the fisheries sector.
Output 3.2.3: Ecosystem Restoration program implemented	Year 5, quarter 2	5%	10 %				15%	- Activities are being prepared, including an LoA with University of Florida to provide capacity building and technical advice.
Output 3.2.4: Pilot restocking programme for a healthy Lake Malombe fishery	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	4%				4%	- The physical and technical capacity needs of the National Aquaculture Centre - Domasi in the establishment of bio secure hatchery facilities have been assessed.
Output 3.2.5: Information sharing enhanced among stakeholders including DoF, FISH, Academia, TCP, GEF.	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	15 %				15%	- Support was provided to the Sixth International Conference of the PanAfrican Fish and Fisheries Association (PAFFA), which was held in Mangochi 24-28 September 2018. FiRM sponsored presenters, including papers derived from the TCP/MLW/3504 studies
Output 3.3.1: Aquaculture	Year 2,	0%	40				40%	- A bathymetry, water quality and ecology survey to assess feasibility

resilience plan developed implemented and underpinned through on-going research and impact tracking program.	quarter 4		%					of cage-based aquaculture along the Upper Shire River was conducted - A feasibility survey of pond sites to assess potential for climate proofing of pond-based aquaculture development aimed at building the resilience capacity of local communities around Lake Malombe to effects of climate change and climate variability was conducted
Output 3.3.2: Potential partners for climate proof aquaculture engaged	Year 4, quarter 4	0%	30 %				30%	- The DoF (National Aquaculture Centre and Sengabay Fisheries Research Station) has been engaged in planning of aquaculture activities, with other stakeholders/partners earmarked to be incorporated once climate proofing options have been adopted and incorporated in the proposed aquaculture resilience plan.
Output 3.3.3: Action learning & knowledge generation program	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	20 %				20%	- FiRM is formulating Learning Sets which will consist of groups of about 5-8 people who will be expected to agree to meet together on a regular basis to discuss Fisheries/ Climate Change/ water and land resources management issues or to develop skills in an area of common interest
Output 3.3.4: Capacity development program for resilient aquaculture developed	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	0%				0%	- A number of training sessions and knowledge generation activities have been outlined. All these will be developed based on results from output 3.3.1.
Output 3.4.1: Participatory learning and extension programmes & demonstrations such as IAA developed and implemented	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	0%				0%	- FiRM is planning to have to have learning centres/ demonstration sites for integrated agriculture aquaculture; - The intended activities include show casing integrated aquaculture best management practices , i.e. Fish/Livestock integration, Fish/Field crops like maize, Fruits, Fish vegetable integration, Aqua-forestry
Output 3.4.2: Catchment area management improved	Year 5, quarter 2	5%	15 %				15%	- Site identification was concluded; the selected micro-catchment, Kulungwi River, is located south-west of Lake Malombe in TA Chimwala, in Msauka and Mpembena villages and upstream is Somanje village . Existing committees within the three villages were identified. The relevant committees related to catchment management, which were partially active and dormant, were

								revamped by re-electing new members into the committees at Mpembena village such as Village Agriculture Committee (VAC). Instituting non-existent management committees in Somanje village will also be done, i.e., village natural resources management committee and village agriculture committee. Trainings will be conducted to enhance their knowledge and skills to carry out their assignments.
Output 3.4.3: Detailed evaluation of fish processing methods conducted	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	0%				0%	- A desk review is under way and some activities have been planned and budgeted for purposes of ground truthing of what has been gathered from literature searches.
Output 3.4.4: Utilization of Solar driers & climate smart FTT smoking kilns promoted	Year 5, quarter 2	0%	0%				0%	- Consultations with the Fisheries Research Unit, which developed the technologies, was conducted. Designs and requirements have been sourced. Activities to identify sites and potential beneficiaries are prepared.

Information on Progress, Outcomes and Challenges on project implementation.

Please briefly summarize main progress achieving the outcomes (cumulative) and outputs (during this fiscal year):
Max 200 words:

- Conducted Ecosystems Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFm) training
- Carried out a consultation meeting for all commercial fishers on the introduction of VMS
- VDRA data collection done and draft report will be ready by June 2019
- Baseline survey data was conducted collected on indicators without baseline values. The report will be ready June 2019
- A bathymetry, water quality and ecology survey to assess feasibility of cage-based aquaculture along the Upper Shire River in order to appraise the Upper Shire River if it is suitable for small-scale cages for rearing of local tilapia *(Oreochromis shiranus)*. The exercise was expected to inform the FiRM project of suitability of cage culture development in the Upper Shire River as recommended by TCP/MLW/3504 Technical Report No. 7d.
- Assessment of the technical and physical capacity/needs of the National Aquaculture Centre (NAC) was carried out to provide a basis for development of a biosecurity plan for NAC.
- A feasibility survey of pond sites to assess potential for climate proofing of pond-based aquaculture was conducted
- An assessment of rainfall monitoring stations was done. This involved;
    - Assessment of existing rainfall stations in three Traditional Authorities in Mangochi;
    - Determining if data collectors are still working; and
    - Assessment of the proposed new sites for additional rainfall station in the three Traditional Authorities in Mangochi
- Designed awareness campaign messages - planning meeting was done and focus areas documented
- Integrated Water shade Management
    - Strategic planning meeting with District Agriculture Development Officer (DADO) and Land Resources Conservation Department to support implementation of IWM done. DADOs office ready to support the activities in collaboration with DoF and FiRM PMU and other relevant stakeholders including Forestry Department

- Self-financing mechanisms training conducted with all 24 Beach Village Committees.
- Five motorbikes were procured by FiRM, and licensing training was provided to district staff

What are the major challenges the project has experienced during this reporting period?
Max 200 words:

Major challenges include :

- Logistical arrangements in organizing meetings/ workshops which involves local stakeholders do not fulfil the expectations of the stakeholders. Therefore, there is need to find ways to organize multi-day meetings so that participants can rest i.e. meetings where participants can be provided with accommodation. Most projects working in Mangochi such as FISH have identified suitable places for having such meetings e.g. Malawi College of Fisheries and Malosa.
- Lengthy procurement procedures and frequent follow-up needs causes delays and other difficulties
- Cash flow is a constraint at times, with limited petty cash and delays in receiving operational advances

Development Objective Ratings, Implementation Progress Ratings and Overall Assessment

	FY2019 Development Objective rating[18]	FY2019 Implementation Progress rating[19]	Comments/reasons justifying the ratings for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the ratings since the previous reporting period
Project Manager / Coordinator	**MS**	**MU**	*Important steps have been taken that contribute towards achieving the development objectives. There are however, constraints in terms of a rapidly increasing populations putting ever more pressure on already heavily exploited resources. The limited progress in Malawi's economic development is major constraint, and coupled with a mostly low education among the target population this reduces options for alternative employment and/or migration to more prosperous areas.*
Budget Holder	**MS**	**S**	*The project has made good progress towards meeting the projects objectives. The recruitment of key project staff is now complete, which is key in ensuring delivery of the projects activities. The overall delivery based on the expenditures is low.*
Lead Technical Officer[20]	**MS**	**MS**	*The project has now made considerable progress towards setting up activities and systems. There are however, still constraints in the issuance of contracts and organization of training. There are long lead in times for recruitment and procurement processes. This hampers project progress, but is manageable.*

[18] **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. Ratings can be Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U) or Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). For more information on ratings, definitions please refer to Annex 1.

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

[20] The LTO will consult the HQ technical officer and all other supporting technical Units.

GEF Funding Liaison Officer	**MS**	**S**	*Overall the project made very good progress this year towards the main development objectives, which can however only be measured towards the end of the project implementation period. As indicated in the last PIR, it will be important to collect the missing baseline information:* "b) if not yet done: all necessary baseline information has to be collected with a defined methodology (e.g. representative household survey) in order to measure the project's progress against targets (results to be included in next PIR). It will otherwise not be possible to measure any progress at outcome level."

3. Risks

Environmental and Social Safeguards (Under the responsibility of the LTO)

Overall Project Risk classification (at project submission)	**Please indicate if the Environmental and Social Risk classification is still valid[21].** If not, what is the new classification and explain.
LOW RISK, with the exception of a MEDIUM RISK associated with the Restocking sub-component	N/A

Please make sure that the below risk table include also Environmental and Social Management Risks captured by the Environmental and social Management Risk Mitigations plans.

Risk ratings

RISK TABLE
*The following table summarizes risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflects **any new risks** identified in the course of project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk in your specific project, **as relevant.***

	Risk	**Risk rating[22]**	**Mitigation Action**	**Progress on mitigation actions[23]**	**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		

[21] **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.

[22] GEF Risk ratings: Low, Medium, Substantial or High

[23] 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[22]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[23]	Notes from the Project Task Force
2	Low pilot level capacities	**M**	DOF researchers involved in the TCP/MLW/3504 project have strengthened their capacity to carry out research Local stakeholders have received substantial support and capacity building under the FISH project		
3	Restoration failures i.e. • Difficulties in regenerating water plants & habitat • Fingerling supply chain problems	**M**	Experience from Lake Chiuta indicate substantial potential for natural regeneration of submerged vegetation following enforced moratorium on fishing Supply of fingerlings for restocking would be addressed primarily using the NAC facilities at Domasi/Zomba. Challenges will include establishing a biosucure facility, sourcing of broodstock in the wild, minimizing hatchery selectivity and mitigating lack of reliable electricity.		
4	Co-management failures i.e. • Resistance to implement/ enforce agreed to measures • Criminal elements in community	**M**	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. 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		

	Risk	Risk rating[22]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[23]	Notes from the Project Task Force
5	Aquaculture failures i.e. • Capacity of local partner too low to implement activities successfully • Negative climate impacts	**M**	It will be essential to ensure that support to small-scale aquaculture operators is properly assessed for risks and profitability. Aquaculture operators with surplus resources (generally larger scale operators) will have higher capability to adapt to negative climate impacts.		
6	Unintended environmental risks e.g. • Genetic pollution • Species imbalances • Loopholes in effluent management	**M**	Established protocols for responsible approaches to restocking and aquaculture will be implemented by the project. Species imbalance may be a relative concept, and is arguably already a fact in L. Malombe. A more natural species composition will require improved management of the fishery and sufficient protection of sanctuaries. Bio securing the hatchery at the National Aquaculture Centre will need to be carried Restocking will be managed through a rigorous design concept and will follow the Responsible Approach (RA) to stock enhancement		

	Risk	Risk rating[22]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[23]	Notes from the Project Task Force
7	Social/domestic conflict	**L**	The project will address this risk by applying a fully inclusive and participatory approach to consultation and planning in relation to management strategies, organizational structures and governance, and will promote a range of technical management options (ranging from improved capture fisheries practices through integrating low-tech aquaculture into smallholder farming systems and medium-level commercial aquaculture), with the potential to generate benefits tailored to each of the stakeholder sectors, including those who fear potential marginalization		
8	Limited political will	**L**	There are recent positive signs of mounting political will. This includes a request from Traditional Authorities to the President, requesting government support to compliance increasing actions. A parliamentary committee on agriculture has recently taken an active interest in fisheries management (partly with support from FISH).		
9	Climate related disasters	**M**	An early warning system for fisheres, using WhatsApp to disseminate messages, is being trialled in Lake Malombe		

	Risk	Risk rating[22]	Mitigation Action	Progress on mitigation actions[23]	Notes from the Project Task Force
10	Negative socioeconomic impacts		The project is designed to give local stakeholders a greater voice in the lake fishery management; project stakeholder awareness building, consultation and participation are measures built into the project Involving local communities in the development of fishery management measures during the execution of the project		

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

FY2018 rating	FY2019 rating	Comments/reason for the rating for FY2019 and any changes (positive or negative) in the rating since the previous reporting period
L	**L**	

4. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the results matrix, in the past 12 months[24]

Change Made to	Yes/No	Describe the Change and Reason for Change
Project Outcomes	No	N/A
Project Outputs	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, evaluations 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 July 2021 Revised NTE: 31 December 2021 Justification: Alignment with actual EOD (first disbursement)

[24] Minor adjustments to project outputs can be made during project inception. Significant adjustments can be made only after a mid-term review/evaluation or supervision missions. The changes need to be discussed with the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, then approved by the whole Project Task Force and endorsed by the Project Steering Committee.

5. Gender Mainstreaming

Information on Progress on gender-responsive measures as documented at CEO

Does the M&E system have gender-disaggregated data? YES

Was a gender analysis undertaken or an equivalent socio-economic assessment? Please briefly indicate the gender differences.

Data for baseline study was collected for monitoring and evaluating the Gender situation through assessing:

a) Different activities which are carried out by girls and women and by men and boys in fish catching and processing, aquaculture, and marketing, to assess whether women catch or buy fish for processing, or process the catch of male household members
b) Determining activities which are performed jointly by women and men
c) Find out what roles do the men and the women play in the fisheries sector?
d) Assessing how men perceive women contribution in the fisheries related advantages of integrating women in the fisheries activities?
e) Assessing membership of women in community groups

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;

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 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 in common 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

Endorsement/Approval in the gender action plan or equivalent (when applicable)?

6. Indigenous Peoples Involvement

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

None identified

7. 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;
- briefly describe stakeholders' engagement events, specifying time, date stakeholders engaged, purpose (information, consultation, participation in decision making, etc.) and outcomes.

The project has consulted individually with most of the stakeholders in the table below. In addition, there has been three key events in the reporting period, namely a Pan African Fish and Fisheries Association conference (PAFFA; 24 – 28 September 2018, Project Launch (PJ 27 November 2018) and Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management training (EAFM; 11 – 15 March 2019

Key stakeholders	PAFFA	PL	EAFM
Department of Fisheries (DoF) (in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security) (national level)	X	X	X
DoF: Mangochi District Office	X	X	X
DoF: 4 sub-stations (Chimwala, Chapola, Kadewere, Upper Shire)		X	
DoF: 2 Aquaculture research stations (Domasi & Mzuzu)	X	X	X
DoF: Fisheries research stations esp. Monkey Bay, but also Senga Bay	X	X	X
DoF: Fisheries college in Mangochi		X	
District (Mangochi) governance structures; District Development Committees (DDCs)		X	
Village governance structures; Village Development Committees (VDCs)		X	
3 Traditional Authorities (Chimwala, Chowe, Mponda)		X	
27 Beach Village Communities /Fisher Association Chairs		X	
45 local fishing villages around Lake Malombe area		X	
District level enforcement agencies (DoF, but also police, magistrates, other)		X	
FISH project and other collaboration partners	X	X	X
Department of Climate Change and Meteorology Services (DCCMS)		X	
LUANAR, Mzuzu University, other think tanks	X		X
NGOs, CBOs		X	X
International expertise e.g. FAO, World Fish Centre	X	X	X
Fisher Association of Malawi (FISAM)		X	X

8. Knowledge Management Activities

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

- Please tell us the story of your project, focusing on how the project has helped to improve people's livelihood and how it is contributing to achieve the expected global environmental benefits

Please provide the links to publications, video materials, etc.

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

Bathometry 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 22Strategic 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

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/Wg9AkEBjdHI

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/2IpBpNdOB4A

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 Implementation Review, 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018

PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

OTHER DOCUMENTS

Visibility and Communication Strategy for 2017-2021.

9. Co-Financing Table

Sources of Co-financing[25]	**Name of Co-financer**	**Type of Co-financing**	**Amount Confirmed at CEO endorsement / approval**	**Actual Amount Materialized at 30 June 2019-**	**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	222,204		
Government	DCCMS	In kind	300 000	40,800		
Government	MoAIWD	In kind	1 500 000	129,861		
Bilateral aid agency	FISH	Grant	5 500 000	4,134,721		
GEF Agency	FAO	In kind	100 000	123,577.64		
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	470 000	560,570.64		
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	2 000 000	282,163		
CSO	LUANAR	In kind	750 000	277,130		
		TOTAL	**12,120,000**	**5,647,449.64**		

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

[25] 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.