



Enabling Activity Project Implementation Report

(01 July 2022 – 30 June 2023)

Project Title:	<i>Minamata Convention Initial Assessment (MIA) Rwanda</i>
GEF ID:	<i>10132</i>
UNIDO ID:	<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 and UNITARA 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 2023:	<i>USD 181,256.48</i>
Original Project Completion Date:	<i>7/17/2021</i>
Project Completion Date as reported in FY22:	<i>12/31/2022</i>
Current SAP Completion Date:	<i>6/30/2023</i>
Expected Project Completion Date:	<i>5/30/2023</i>
Expected Financial Closure Date:	<i>11/30/2023</i>
UNIDO Project Manager¹:	<i>Ozunimi Iti Lilian</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>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</i>	<i>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</i>
<p><i>For the year FY22, the inception of the project and implementation advanced significantly due to the fact that, covid 19 restriction measures were beginning to be phased out. With very few activities to be carried out in the field during this time, the virtual and hybrid means employed in project activity implementation were sufficient to move the project forward thus the highly satisfactory rating in GEOs and DOs recorded.</i></p> <p><i>For the year FY23 a highly satisfactory rating for the GEOs and DOs was recorded as well because during this implementation time, the covid 19 restriction measures were significantly phased out making it possible for all project activities to be implemented thus the Highly satisfactory rating in GOEs and DOs recorded.</i></p>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</i>	<i>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</i>
<p><i>For the year FY22, a highly satisfactory rating in IP Progress was recorded due to the fact that, the covid 19 restrictions were beginning to be phased out allowing for the implementation of a significant proportion of project activities.</i></p> <p><i>For the year FY23, the phasing out of covid 19 measures again significantly progressed allowing for a significant advancement in the Implementation of project activities. In the FY23 IP rating is considered Highly satisfactory because all project activities were implemented, and project report finalised and disseminated.</i></p>		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Low Risk (L)</i>	<i>Low Risk (L)</i>
<p><i>For the year FY22, the overall risk rating was low. The main risk associated with the project was the Covid 19 restriction measures put in place by the Government. It was observed during this IP time that Implementation of project activities significantly progressed due to the beginning of the uplifting and relaxation of then existing stringent measures.</i></p> <p><i>For the year FY23, the stringent covid 19 measures were significantly reduced thus allowing for a significant progress in project implementation and thus the overall low-risk rating recorded.</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

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

During project implementation, different activities were carried out in order to achieve the project outputs. All planned activities for the year 2023 have been implemented successfully.

The following outcomes have been achieved:

- *Institutional capacity and legal gaps assessment reports and a list of the needed policy reforms completed.*
- *Final MIA report completed.*
- *MIA communication strategy completed.*
- *Stakeholders Capacity building workshop conducted.*
- *MIA dissemination workshop conducted.*
- *REMA intervention plan completed.*
- *Public outreach awareness raising is ongoing.*

Challenges:

- *The main challenge during this IP phase was the delay in receiving feedback from UNITAR during the Review of the MIA report.*

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

Stakeholders have been significantly involved in the project implementation from project inception through to dissemination.

The following provide details on stakeholder involvements during the IP FY23

- *Steering committee members in partnership with other relevant stakeholders were involved in all activities and contributed significantly in the project implementation to ensure the accuracy of data used in MIA report and all its associated reports.*
- *The Training on UNEP mercury inventory toolkit and provision of inputs on the data collection tools were significantly supported by UINITAR & UNIDO,*
- *Participation of UNITAR in the review of draft reports, validation meetings and providing guidance and comments*
- *Stakeholders from all concerned institutions were also involved from the initiation of the MIA report to the MIA dissemination workshop.*

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.

From inception through implementation and project finalisation gender responsive measures were taken into consideration in implementing the MIA Rwanda. For example, gender-responsive measures, were taken into consideration during Steering committee creation and all project coordination team formulations.

All project activities were implemented taking gender-responsive measures into consideration this is evidenced in the reports for example the MIA final report and MIA Communication strategy both have a specific chapter on gender.

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

*For the year FY23 the following **knowledge activities / products**, have been submitted to REMA and UNITAR during the progress of project implementation:*

- *Institutional capacity and legal assessment report*
- *Training on UNEP mercury inventory toolkit and provision of inputs to the data collection tools by*

UNITAR & UNIDO,

- Participation of UNITAR in the review of draft reports, validation meetings and providing guidance and comments
- Stakeholders from all concerned institutions were also involved from the first step of MIA report preparation to the MIA dissemination workshop.
- Workshop to disseminate MIA report.

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

III. Project Risk Management

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

From the onset of the project, the outbreak of covid 19 led to the instating of covid 19 restriction measures which stood out as the main risk to project implementation progress. In the FY23 these covid associated measures were

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%.

progressively uplifted nonetheless, activities such as workshops, meetings, interviews and data collection were affected given that the number of people allowed in physical meetings were reduced, use of hotels, working physically at workplaces were all limited.

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

All project activities have been completed. REMA and UNIDO are now dealing with financial closure of the project.

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
Kigali-Rwanda	1.56	30.03	202061	

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.