



Enabling Activity Project Implementation Report

(01 July 2022 – 30 June 2023)

Project Title:	<i>National action plan for the artisanal and small-scale gold mining sector in the Plurinational State of Bolivia</i>
GEF ID:	<i>10310</i>
UNIDO ID:	<i>180123</i>
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	<i>GEF-7</i>
Country(ies)	<i>Plurinational State of Bolivia</i>
Region:	<i>LAC - Latin America and Caribbean</i>
GEF Focal Area:	<i>Chemicals and Waste (CW)</i>
Implementing Department/Division:	<i>ENV / MCM</i>
Executing Agency(ies):	<i>Ministry of Environment and Water, Ministry of Mining and Metallurgy, Ministry of Health, Fundación Medmin</i>
Project Duration (months):	<i>24</i>
Extension(s):	<i>1</i>
GEF Project Financing:	<i>500,000 USD</i>
Agency Fee:	<i>47,500 USD</i>
Co-financing Amount:	<i>31,000 USD</i>
Date of EA Approval:	<i>7/7/2020</i>
UNIDO Approval Date:	<i>8/28/2020</i>
Actual Implementation Start Date:	<i>9/14/2020</i>
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2023:	<i>USD 399,994.05</i>
Original Project Completion Date:	<i>12/30/2022</i>
Project Completion Date as reported in FY22:	<i>12/31/2023</i>
Current SAP Completion Date:	<i>12/31/2023</i>
Expected Project Completion Date:	<i>12/31/2024</i>
Expected Financial Closure Date:	<i>6/30/2025</i>
UNIDO Project Manager ¹ :	<i>Ms. Lamia Benabbas</i>

¹ Person responsible for report content

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. FY23. Please also provide a short justification for the selected ratings for FY23.

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. FY22, in the last column.

Overall Ratings ³	FY23	FY22
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
<i>There is a renewed interest in working on mercury-related matters in the country following various assessments on how indigenous peoples are being affected by mercury contamination, mercury use, and their livelihoods. The main government institutions have re-prioritized this topic in their agendas, which should positively impact the project activities.</i>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
<i>While the contracts with the three co-executing ministries are still on hold due to the administrative requirements, the co-executing entity Fundación Medmin has been able to make progress with the activities.</i>		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>
<i>The risk rating remains the same as in FY21 and FY22. The mining cooperatives in Bolivia have a high political power and could jeopardize the development of the NAP.</i>		

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

Progress and outcomes

- The Project Steering Committee (CDN) has been formed and coordination meetings held with the ministries involved.*
- The NAP Project has been officially launched with the media and civil society as a whole.*
- The ASGM Baseline Exhaustive Analysis Study in Bolivia has been carried out and presented.*
- The Exploratory Study including the methodology and steps to be followed for the ASGM Diagnosis in Bolivia has been presented and approved by the CDN.*
- The technical team and the ministries have been trained in the elaboration of mercury action*

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

plans.

- Objectives and strategic lines were elaborated as a starting point for the construction of the Action Plan.

Challenges

There has been another change in Government, which further delays project activities. The contracts with the co-executing ministries are still pending

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

The stakeholder engagement with institutional authorities is still challenging. Formal communications are required for minor decisions adding a substantial delay every time there is a need for inputs or feedback. There has been another change in Government and the contracts with the co-executing ministries are still pending.

Four (4) coordination meetings with the CDN were held in the reporting period. Three (3) meetings after the project was launched in January and one (1) and a follow-up meeting in March were organised.

Fundación Medmin is currently part of the Grupo Inter-Institucional de Trabajo sobre Oro Responsable (GIT-OR) whose main objective is to promote responsible mining in order to reduce the negative social and environmental impacts of this activity. The network is engaged with the project and will contribute with inputs to the development of the NAP.

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.

Since the level of mercury exposure and subsequent impact on human health are determined by social and biological factors, women, children, and men may be exposed to different types, frequencies and level of mercury. Therefore, gender inclusion and integration is a fundamental element of the project, and is building on UNIDO's and GEF's respective gender policies.

The work plan developed integrates gender-related aspects both in the team structure as well as on the activities to be conducted. There is a gender specialist within the team that will be in charge of mainstreaming gender into the National Action Plan (NAP).

A gender baseline study on ASM in Bolivia has been carried out as part of the Exhaustive Analysis.

Statistical data has been collected on women's participation in decision-making, jobs, labor rights and participation.

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

The technical team and ministry representatives trained in the elaboration of mercury action plans.

Exploratory Study as a methodological basis for the collection of information to be replicated in the following years.

Database of information gathered through case studies in mining cooperatives.

Baseline diagnosis of ASGM in Bolivia.

The objectives and strategic lines of the NAP are the basis on which all planning will be built.

Dissemination and information materials about the NAP.

Statistical data on mercury imports over the last 10 years are available.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	<i>The project has requested an extension due to delays faced.</i>
<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.

During 2021 and 2022 there were no impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the progress of the project.

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

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%.

The project has requested an extension due to the continuing change in Government authorities, which has significantly delayed the beginning of the project activities.

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](#)

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location and Activity Description
<i>e.g. Nigeria - Abuja</i>	<i>9.06</i>	<i>7.5</i>	2352778	
La Paz	16.50626	68.15028		

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

--

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. **Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period, i.e. 1 July 2022 – 30 June 2023.
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.