



Enabling Activity Project Implementation Report

(01 July 2022 – 30 June 2023)

Project Title:	Minamata Convention Initial Assessment in Lebanon
GEF ID:	10126
UNIDO ID:	160199
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	<i>GEF-7</i>
Country(ies)	Lebanon
Region:	<i>MNA - Middle East and North Africa</i>
GEF Focal Area:	<i>Chemicals and Waste (CW)</i>
Implementing Department/Division:	<i>ENV / MCM</i>
Executing Agency(ies):	<i>The Ministry of Environment</i>
Project Duration (months):	<i>24</i>
Extension(s):	<i>3</i>
GEF Project Financing:	<i>USD 200,000</i>
Agency Fee:	<i>USD 19,000</i>
Co-financing Amount:	<i>USD 18,600</i>
Date of EA Approval:	4/7/2016
UNIDO Approval Date:	11/27/2019
Actual Implementation Start Date:	11/27/2021
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2022:	
Original Project Completion Date:	11/27/2021
Project Completion Date as reported in FY21:	5/27/2022
Current SAP Completion Date:	11/27/2023
Expected Project Completion Date:	11/27/2023
Expected Financial Closure Date:	12/31/2023

I. Overview of project status

Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and select corresponding ratings for the current reporting period, i.e. FY22. Please also provide a short justification for the selected ratings for FY22.

In view of the GEF Secretariat's intent to start following the ability of projects to adopt the concept of adaptive management², Agencies are expected to closely monitor changes that occur from year to year and demonstrate that they are not simply implementing plans but modifying them in response to developments and circumstances. In order to facilitate with this assessment, please introduce the ratings as reported in the previous reporting cycle, i.e. FY21, in the last column.

Overall Ratings ³	FY22	FY21
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>
<i>No relevant progress was achieved</i>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>	<i>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</i>
<i>Limited progress in implementation due to critical situation in field</i>		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>
<i>No change in risk profile against PYR 2021</i>		

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please elaborate on progress, challenges and outcomes of **project implementation activities**.

The project was approved in UNIDO as of 27 November 2019 and the budget became operational immediately.

¹ Person responsible for report content

² Adaptive management in the context of an intentional approach to decision-making and adjustments in response to new available information, evidence gathered from monitoring, evaluation or research, and experience acquired from implementation, to ensure that the goals of the activity are being reached efficiently

³ Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and assure that the indicated ratings correspond to the narrative of the report

Project inception workshop scheduled in January 2020 could not be held due to Government re-structuring. A new Government was announced 1 February 2020, however, the restructuring was followed by the COVID lock-down.

The devastating explosion in Beirut area summer 2020 jeopardized again the efforts. The Government members resigned and the administration was in re-organization.

With the slow return to limited activities in 2021 due to COVID restrictions, UNIDO was making efforts to organize virtually the project inception, jointly with the Government representatives.

Operationally, the project was launched, and terms of reference for executing entity were agreed with high-level officials' approval in Ministry of Environment. Bilateral meetings held second half of 2021 concluded Terms of Reference for selection of national executing entity. Bidding exercises was launched by UNIDO first semester of 2022, offers collection was achieved, however the administrative process of selecting an executing entity was not concluded due to communication shortages with national partner (The Ministry of Environment). Execution could not progress first half of 2022. Lebanon field situation is critical. There are electricity failures and communication continued to be affected by the situation in field.

Due to critical economic situation in the country the bidding exercise could not be completed by UNIDO until June 2023. Currently, UNIDO field office is in contact with Government representatives and with Lebanon GEF Operational Focal Point to assess the viability of farther extending the project or its cancellation.

2. Please elaborate on progress, challenges and outcomes of **stakeholder engagement**, using the previous reporting period as a basis.

Limited consultation were held with national coordinating partner, the Ministry of Environment. In lack of concluding the selection of the main national executing partner in field, farther engagement with national stakeholders could not be achieved.

3. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please report on the progress **achieved on implementing gender-responsive measures**, as documented in the project document.

Gender mainstreaming is included as a part of the project, but not as a separate component/output. Therefore, no detailed gender analysis was included at the needs assessment stage.

4. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please elaborate on any **knowledge activities / products**, as outlined in the project document.

No progress has been achieved to date beyond the launch of the project.

The overall objective of the MIA is to assist Lebanon to enable policy and strategic decision-making and to prioritize areas for future interventions under Minamata Convention regime.

The country will achieve first Mercury inventory profile The project is envisaged to strengthen national capacity to fulfil obligations under the Minamata Convention and promote effective implementation.

II. Minor Amendments

1. Please briefly elaborate on any **minor amendments**⁴ to the approved project that may have been introduced during the reporting period or indicate as not applicable (NA).

Please tick each category for which a change has occurred and provide a description of the change in the related textbox. You may attach supporting documentation, as appropriate.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Results Framework	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Components and Cost	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Management	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity Category	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor Project Objective Change	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Safeguards	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk Analysis	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-Financing	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Location of Project Activities	NA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others	NA

III. Project Risk Management

1. Please indicate any implication of the **COVID-19** pandemic on the progress of the project.

The outbreak of COVID-19 has affected the project implementation. In particular to Lebanon, COVID outbreak was followed by the devastating explosion in Beirut area in summer 2020 jeopardizing again the efforts of progressing the implementation. COVID-19 had implications on the project's ability to finish by the expected completion date and the project was already extended until 27 Nov 2023.

2. Please clarify if the project is facing delays and is expected to request an **extension**.

No extension (beyond approved date) 27 Nov 2023 is expected.

⁴ As described in Annex 9 of the *GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines*, **minor amendments** are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5%.

IV. GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate.

Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#)

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.

This project includes pre-ratification technical assistance and does not envisage investment activities or activities at specific locations

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. **Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period.
2. **Responsibility:** The responsibility for preparing the report lies with the project manager in consultation with the division chief and director.
3. **Evaluation:** For the report to be used effectively as a tool for annual self-evaluation, project counterparts need to be fully involved. The (main) counterpart can provide any additional information considered essential, including a simple rating of project progress.
4. **Results-based management:** The annual project/programme progress reports are required by the RBM programme component focal points to obtain information on outcomes observed.

Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) ratings	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed <u>all</u> 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 <u>achieve most</u> of its <u>major</u> global environmental objectives, and yields satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to <u>achieve most</u> of its major <u>relevant</u> objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modes overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environmental benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve <u>some</u> of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to <u>achieve only some</u> of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected <u>not</u> to achieve <u>most</u> of its major global environmental objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, <u>any</u> of its major global environmental objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Implementation Progress (IP)	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of <u>all</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of <u>most</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of <u>most</u> components in <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of <u>none</u> of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk ratings	
Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks.

Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.