



Enabling Activity Project Implementation Report

(01 July 2021 – 30 June 2022)

Project Title:	<i>Minamata Convention Initial Assessment (MIA) Rwanda</i>
GEF ID:	<i>10132</i>
UNIDO ID 180267	<i>180267</i>
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	<i>GEF-7</i>
Country(ies)	<i>Rwanda</i>
Region:	<i>AFR - Africa</i>
GEF Focal Area:	<i>Chemicals and Waste (CW)</i>
Implementing Department/Division:	<i>ENV / MCM</i>
Executing Agency(ies):	<i>Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) UNITAR as Co-Executing Agency</i>
Project Duration (months):	<i>24 months</i>
Extension(s):	<i>1</i>
GEF Project Financing:	<i>USD 200,000</i>
Agency Fee:	<i>USD 19,000</i>
Co-financing Amount:	<i>USD 18,400</i>
Date of EA Approval:	<i>4/10/2019</i>
UNIDO Approval Date:	<i>11/2/2018</i>
Actual Implementation Start Date:	<i>8/8/2019</i>
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2022:	<i>181,493.03</i>
Original Project Completion Date:	<i>8/8/2021</i>
Project Completion Date as reported in FY21:	<i>12/31/2022</i>
Current SAP Completion Date:	<i>12/31/2022</i>

Expected Project Completion Date:	11/30/2022
Expected Financial Closure Date:	12/31/2022
UNIDO Project Manager ¹ :	Ozunimi Lilian Iti

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>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>
<p>For FY21, the GEOs/DOs ratings were satisfactory because the project was still in its inception stage and even though COVID-19-related restrictions were still in place, this did not cause limit the progress made in initiating project activities. At this stage, not much fieldwork nor in-person meetings were required as such teleworking and telecommunication were employed to advance the project thus contributing satisfactorily to Global Environmental Objectives and Development Objectives.</p> <p>For FY22 Most COVID-19-related restrictions were uplifted thus significant progress was registered in the implementation of activities on the project adding up to the highly satisfactory GEOs/DOs rating registered.</p>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>
<p>For FY21 and FY22, the implementation progress was satisfactory.</p> <p>For the year, 2021 COVID-19 measures were still in place causing some limitations nonetheless the project was still in its last stages of inception requiring no significant in-person involvement or field visits. For the year 2022 implementation progressed steadily because at this stage most COVID-19 restrictions were lifted and as the project was in the full</p>		

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

Implementation phase this allowed for the site visits and in person meetings thus leading up to satisfactory progress in the implementation of project activities.		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Low Risk (L)</i>	<i>Low Risk (L)</i>
<p>In FY21 the project implementation progress was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic due to restrictions on meetings, workshops, travels, and remote working settings imposed thus the low-risk rating registered.</p> <p>For the FY22 the Project which is currently in its concluding stages still has one major activity pending and that is the Public Health strategy, which was delayed at the national level nevertheless, the procurement process is currently ongoing thus the low-risk rating registered.</p>		

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

<p>Progress</p> <p>The main objective of the Minamata Convention Initial Assessment for Rwanda is to complete post-ratification activities under the Minamata Convention to enable policy and strategic decision-making and to prioritize areas for future interventions, through the preparation of a Minamata Convention Initial Assessment (MIA)</p> <p>To achieve the set objectives of the project the following outputs were projected:</p> <p>Output 1: Project coordination mechanism established and institutional gaps identified</p> <p>Output 2: Review of existing mercury-related regulations and identification of needed policy reforms to prepare for implementation of the Minamata Convention completed</p> <p>Output 3: National mercury profile established based on the initial inventory and key sectors identified for intervention and investment to reduce, and where possible eliminate, mercury use, release, and emissions</p> <p>Output 4: Development of Minamata Initial Assessment (MIA) report</p> <p>Output 5: Dissemination of information among relevant stakeholder groups (academia, public and private sectors, and civil society) conducted</p> <p>During project implementation, different activities have been carried to realise the above-mentioned outputs. Currently, the following outcomes have been attained and deliverables submitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishment of the project coordination team - Establishment of National Steering Committee - Institutional capacity assessment report - Legislative gaps assessment report and a list of the needed policy reforms - Report on preliminary data collection - Inventory and MIA reports were validated by the NSG and National implementation team - Draft MIA communication strategy has been submitted, reviewed and the team provided comments for improvement <p>Challenges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Firstly, the main challenge faced was the COVID-19 pandemic that affected the project implementation due to lockdown measures and other associated restrictions. Activities like workshops, meetings, interviews and data collection were significantly affected given that during the peak of the pandemic physical meetings, use of hotels, and working physically at workplaces were all restricted. Due to the mentioned reasons, the project activities could not be timely executed as planned ▪ Secondly, the procurement process to identify service providers (Consultants), took a very long period than expected reason being that a second tender had to be republished because the first unsuccessful ▪ Thirdly, the process leading up to the transfer of the first instalment took longer than expected, which contributed to the delay in onset of the implementation of activities.
--

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

<p>During the implementation of MIA project, the initial activities involved establishment of National project coordination team including REMA, representatives from UNIDO and UNITAR and the National Steering Committee with all the relevant stakeholders from government agencies, private sector, civil society</p>

organisations and international organisations. Stakeholders have been part of the project implementation process since project kick-off in the following ways:

- Steering committee validates every step of the project implementation from inception stage to the final document
- Steering committee members together with other relevant stakeholders participate in information sharing, interviews and giving advice to consultancy teams during execution of different tasks
- Trainings on UNEP mercury inventory toolkit by UITAR & UNIDO,
- Participation of UNITAR in review of draft reports, validation meetings and providing guidance and comments
- We are developing a MIA communication strategy (draft report already reviewed and comments provided) that will guide on the appropriate channels to disseminate the project findings and future awareness methodology

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 has been considered in all aspects during project implementation. Below are examples of how gender has been integrated during project implementation:

- There is an almost equal number of men and women on the steering committee.
- The REMA project coordination team also included men and women (3 female and 2 male)
- The managing Director for the consultancy firm to conduct the work is a female
- During interviews and consultations, both males and females were surveyed in order to cover affecting both genders
- A section on mercury emission impacts on Gender, population at risk, vulnerable groups and mitigation measures will be included in all the reports

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

As of now, the following are expected deliverables on the project that have been submitted:

- Institutional capacity assessment report (submitted)
- Legislative gaps analysis report (submitted)
- Inventory report(submitted)

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

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"/>	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.

Covid 19 pandemic affected the project implementation due to lockdown measures and other restrictions imposed. Activities like workshops, meetings, interviews and data collection were highly impacted given that physical meetings, use of hotels, and working physically at workplaces were all restricted. Nevertheless, there was an adaptation and thus the use of digitisation to advance project implementation was employed.

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

N/A

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 p respects 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.