



Enabling Activity Project Implementation Report

(01 July 2023 – 30 June 2024)

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>TCS/CEG/RMC</i>
Executing Agency(ies):	<i>Ministry of Environment and Water, Ministry of Mining and Metallurgy, Ministry of Health and Sports, Fundación Medmin</i>
Project Duration (months):	<i>24</i>
Extension(s):	<i>2</i>
GEF Project Financing:	<i>500,000</i>
Agency Fee:	<i>47,500</i>
Co-financing Amount:	<i>31,000</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 2024:	<i>USD 475,873.82</i>
Original Project Completion Date:	<i>12/30/2022</i>
Project Completion Date as reported in FY23:	<i>12/31/2024</i>
Current SAP Completion Date:	<i>12/31/2024</i>
Expected Project Completion Date:	<i>12/31/2025</i>
Expected Financial Closure Date:	<i>12/31/2026</i>
UNIDO Project Manager¹:	<i>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. FY24. Please also provide a short justification for the selected ratings for FY24.

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. FY23, in the last column.

Overall Ratings ³	FY24	FY23
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
<p><i>The rating is the same as in FY23. Regarding the activities under responsibility of the Ministry of Environment and Water, Ministry of Mining and Metallurgy, Ministry of Health and Sports, there has been no substantial progress in this reporting period.</i></p> <p><i>The latest updates are: The Ministry of Environment and Water and the Ministry of Mining and Metallurgy have countersigned amendments to extend their contracts with UNIDO. The Ministry of Health and Sports is pending countersignature of their Agreement with UNIDO (subcontract).</i></p> <p><i>MEDMIN is awaiting feedback from the Ministries on the proposed strategic lines, objectives, activities and goals. These are the reasons why we consider that progress in the implementation of the project is still moderately satisfactory.</i></p>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
<p><i>The Ministry of Environment and Water has signed the contract/agreement, as has the Ministry of Mining and Metallurgy, but the Ministry of Health and Sports has yet to sign.</i></p> <p><i>Due to the granted project extension, amendments to the contacts have been prepared and are pending countersignature.</i></p> <p><i>The co-executing agency, the MEDMIN Foundation, has been able to proceed with the dissemination of the Comprehensive Analysis Study of Artisanal and Small-Scale Mining in Bolivia with the three ministries involved, the mining associations (FENCOMIN-Ferecomin Sur; FERRECO and FECOMAN) and the Central de Pueblos Indígenas de La Paz.</i></p> <p><i>In parallel with the dissemination process, progress has been made in developing the strategies of the Action Plan (objectives, activities, actions, targets) so that there is a basis for the work of participatory formulation of the Plan.</i></p>		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Moderate Risk (M).</i>	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>
<p><i>The risk rating is moderate. This is mainly due to cooperatives in the gold mining sector not accepting the data on mercury use and losses that is shown in the Comprehensive Analysis Study, and demanding complementary studies as a condition for participation in the working groups for the preparation of the National Action Plan.</i></p>		

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

There is a risk that the Ministry of Environment and Water will not commit to accepting the comprehensive study on artisanal and small-scale mining: the results of the study reflect high levels of mercury use in the current gold mining cooperatives, which could politically compromise this ministry, given that 2025 is an election year.

The 'moderate risk' is being managed by producing case studies in gold mining cooperatives that were selected by the National Federation of Mining Cooperatives. Here, mercury use will be quantified with the support of the Secretaries of the Environment of the Departmental Federations (Federaciones Departamentales). These will verify in the field the methodology used in carrying out the Exhaustive Analysis Study. As per the last Technical Committee of 08/20/24, the results of these field visits will be presented as a complementary appendix to the report.

The MEDMIN Foundation will present a technical document in which the ministries will be explained their obligations to conclude the Action Plan and carry out its socialization and validation.

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

Progress and achievements

Formation of the Technical Committee to monitor and advise on the formulation of the National Action Plan as an operational body, with the participation of technical focal points from the Ministries of Environment and Water, Mining and Metallurgy, Health and Sports.

Coordination activities with the various gold miners' associations for the dissemination of the Comprehensive Analysis Study of ASM in Bolivia.

Dissemination of the Comprehensive Analysis Study of Artisanal and Small-Scale Mining in Bolivia with the Minister of Environment and Water, the Minister of Mining and Metallurgy, the Vice-Minister of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change, Forestry and Development, the Vice-Minister of Mining Regulation and Fiscalisation, Federation of Mining Cooperatives of Bolivia (FENCOMIN), Regional Federation of Auriferous Mining Cooperatives (FERRECO), Regional Federation of Mining Cooperatives of the South (Ferecomin Sur), Ombudsman's Office, Central of Indigenous Peoples of La Paz.

Challenges faced

Compliance of the Ministry of Environment and Water, the Ministry of Mining and Metallurgy, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Sports with the activities and results foreseen in their TORs for the generation of inputs contributing to the elaboration of the National Action Plan.

The Ministry of Environment and Water takes the leading role in coordinating the activities foreseen for the elaboration of the NAP and prioritizes its ministerial agenda in order to meet the deadlines set in the updated work plan of the NAP.

Organization of technical roundtables with the participation of representatives of mining associations and stakeholders involved in gold mining.

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

During the reporting period, (2) National Steering Committee meetings and (2) Project Technical Committee meetings were held.

Two (2) meetings have been held with MEDMIN's technical team to identify the strategic lines of the

NAP, and to draw up a matrix of goals, activities and actions in the short, medium and long term, which will serve as a working outline for the participatory technical roundtables to be held with institutional, social and productive actors.

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 (in a previous reporting period) as part of the Exhaustive Analysis.

Coordination has taken place with the gender specialists of Cumbre del Sajama to organize an event to present the results of the Comprehensive Analysis Study of Artisanal and Small-scale Mining, APE, and to outline the activities and actions under the Gender Inclusion Strategic Line of the Action Plan.

There has been 2 events on Health Risks due to Mercury exposure, in which around 60 women miners from different cooperative federations participated.

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

An online document on the Comprehensive ASM Analysis Study in Bolivia is available in an editable format, so that the ministries involved can make their contributions, additions and comments, and thus obtain a final version that can be processed by all interested parties.

An interaction matrix has been drawn up, reflecting the objectives, activities and actions in the short, medium and long term, which will serve as a working outline for the participatory technical roundtables to be developed with institutional, social and productive actors.

In order to communicate the scope and results of the Action Plan in an appropriate and didactic way, there are different versions of PowerPoint presentations and banners aimed at different types of actors involved.

The information matrix on legal imports of mercury into the country is regularly updated with basic information from the National Institute of Statistics and the National Customs.

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.

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%.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Results Framework	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Components and Cost	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Management	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	The project has been granted an extension until 31.12.2024.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity Category	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor Project Objective Change	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Safeguards	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk Analysis	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-Financing	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Location of Project Activities	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others	

III. Project Risk Management

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

The project was granted an extension in this reporting period, not only because of the constant change of government authorities in the ministries involved, but also because of the delay in the signature of contracts/agreements between UNIDO and the Ministries of Environment and Water, Mining and Metallurgy, and Health and Sports, which were to contribute with the results foreseen in their TORs as inputs for the elaboration of the National Action Plan.

Amendments to the execution contracts have been prepared to reflect the revised delivery schedule. However, they are still pending countersignature. The Ministerial administrative procedures for signature are lengthy and communication has been intermittent due to the frequent change in the focal points.

Accordingly, it is expected to request an extension.

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>La Paz, Bolivia</i>	<i>-16.5</i>	<i>-68.15</i>	<i>3911925</i>	

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.
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.

