



Enabling Activity Project Implementation Report

(01 July 2023 – 30 June 2024)

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>2</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 2024:	<i>USD 194,277.96</i>
Original Project Completion Date:	<i>7/17/2021</i>
Project Completion Date as reported in FY23:	<i>5/31/2023</i>
Current SAP Completion Date:	<i>10/31/2024</i>
Expected Project Completion Date:	<i>8/31/2024</i>
Expected Financial Closure Date:	<i>9/30/2024</i>
UNIDO Project Manager ¹ :	<i>Ms Ozunimi Lilian ITI</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>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</i>	<i>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</i>
<p><i>FY23: The Highly Satisfactory rating for GEOs and DOs in FY23 was due to the significant easing of COVID-19 restrictions, which enabled full implementation of project activities and achievement of objectives under more favorable conditions.</i></p> <p><i>FY24: As we are conducting the terminal evaluation for the completed project in FY24, the rating will reflect the comprehensive assessment of the project's overall effectiveness and sustainability. This evaluation will consider the long-term impact and any emerging issues, which may influence the final rating.</i></p>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</i>	<i>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</i>
<p><i>For FY23, the phasing out of COVID-19 measures significantly advanced the implementation of project activities. The Highly Satisfactory rating reflects that all activities were completed, and the project report was finalized and disseminated.</i></p> <p><i>FY24: As we conduct the terminal evaluation in FY24, the focus will shift to assessing the overall impact and effectiveness of the completed project. This evaluation, expected to be finalized by the end of August 2024.</i></p>		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Low Risk (L)</i>	<i>Low Risk (L)</i>
<p><i>FY23: The risk rating in FY23 was lower due to the gradual easing of COVID-19 restrictions, which reduced operational uncertainties and allowed for smoother project implementation. This improved environment contributed to a more favorable risk assessment during this period.</i></p> <p><i>FY24: The risk rating for FY24, as we conduct the terminal evaluation, is likely adjusted to reflect the post-implementation phase.</i></p>		

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

In 2023, all planned project activities were successfully completed, including the assessment reports, MIA communication strategy, stakeholder workshops, and the REMA intervention plan. Challenges included delays in procuring service providers and receiving feedback from UNITAR.

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

The project is now complete, and we are currently conducting the terminal evaluation.

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

Stakeholders have been actively involved throughout the project and continue to be highly supportive during the current terminal evaluation. Their engagement has been essential in ensuring data accuracy, toolkit training, and effective dissemination of results. Additionally, stakeholders will play a key role in the terminal evaluation process, participating in interviews to provide insights and contribute to the assessment of the project's overall outcomes and impact.

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 to the finalization of the project, gender-responsive measures were consistently integrated into the implementation of MIA Rwanda. Gender considerations were applied in forming the Steering Committee and the project coordination team. All activities incorporated these measures, as reflected in the MIA final report and MIA Communication Strategy, both of which include dedicated chapters on gender.

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

In FY24, key knowledge activity and product includes the completion of the terminal evaluation report, which synthesized insights and outcomes from the entire project.

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

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"/>	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 initially posed significant risks to project implementation, primarily due to strict restriction measures. In FY23, as these restrictions were progressively lifted, project activities such as workshops, meetings, interviews, and data collection began to recover. Despite this improvement, challenges persisted with limitations on the number of participants in physical meetings, restricted use of hotels, and constraints on physical workplace activities. In FY24, while the terminal evaluation is underway, the lingering effects of these past restrictions are being addressed, with adjustments made to ensure effective stakeholder engagement and data collection despite ongoing constraints.

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

REMA and UNIDO are currently managing the financial closure of the project while the terminal evaluation is ongoing, ensuring that all administrative and financial aspects are finalized.

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	-1.94995	30.05885	20261	

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.