



## Enabling Activity Project Implementation Report

(01 July 2021 – 30 June 2022)

<b>Project Title:</b>	<i>Minamata initial assessment and national action plan on the artisanal and small-scale gold mining sector in Nicaragua</i>
<b>GEF ID:</b>	10148
<b>UNIDO ID:</b>	190004
<b>GEF Replenishment Cycle:</b>	GEF-7
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Nicaragua
<b>Region:</b>	LAC - Latin America and Caribbean
<b>GEF Focal Area:</b>	Chemicals and Waste (CW)
<b>Implementing Department/Division:</b>	ENV / MCM
<b>Executing Agency(ies):</b>	<i>Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARENA), Ministry of Energy and Mines (MEM), Ministry of Health (MINSA), Natural Commission for Registration and Control of Toxic Substances (CNRCSST), and UNITAR</i>
<b>Project Duration (months):</b>	24
<b>Extension(s):</b>	1
<b>GEF Project Financing:</b>	700,000 USD
<b>Agency Fee:</b>	66,500 USD
<b>Co-financing Amount:</b>	30,000 USD
<b>Date of EA Approval:</b>	1/30/2020
<b>UNIDO Approval Date:</b>	4/3/2020
<b>Actual Implementation Start Date:</b>	4/3/2020
<b>Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2022:</b>	679,485
<b>Original Project Completion Date:</b>	12/1/2021
<b>Project Completion Date as reported in FY21:</b>	4/3/2022
<b>Current SAP Completion Date:</b>	12/31/2022
<b>Expected Project Completion Date:</b>	12/31/2022
<b>Expected Financial Closure Date:</b>	6/30/2023

## 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 management<sup>2</sup>, 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 <sup>3</sup>	FY22	FY21
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>
<i>While delays have been experienced, there is a strong interest and commitment of the Government of Nicaragua to work on mercury-related matters and implement their obligations in relation to the Minamata Convention on mercury. The GEO of the project will be eventually achieved with the submission of both MIA and NAP reports to the secretariat of the Minamata Convention.</i>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
<i>The activities are being implemented and some of the deliverables have already been submitted in a draft version. However, the progress remains unequal and uncoordinated among institutions.</i>		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>
<i>The administrative procedures required in the country and the lack of coordination among public institution continues to be a challenge that could pose additional delays in the submission of reports and related disbursement of payments.</i>		

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

*During the reporting period, the different teams have been recruited to elaborate (i) the MIA and (ii) the NAP on ASGM.*

<sup>1</sup> Person responsible for report content

<sup>2</sup> 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

<sup>3</sup> 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

*During the second half of 2021, the training sessions on “UNEP’s Toolkit for identification and quantification of mercury releases” and “UNEP’s Toolkit to Estimate Mercury Use and Practice in ASGM” were conducted with the respective teams in charge of the data collection and processing.*

*Meetings, workshops and events have been organized by all institutions (MARENA, CNRCST, MEM and MINSA) in order to prepare the different deliverables expected under the project.*

*The drafts of the following deliverables have been submitted:*

- *Mercury-related institutional gaps analysis report;*
- *Mercury-related policies, strategies, laws and regulations assessment report;*
- *Mercury-related regulatory recommendations report;*
- *National mercury inventory (Level 2);*
- *National baseline on ASGM;*
- *Methodology to collect health-related information.*

*In addition, field visits to collect data on ASGM to finalize the national baseline were conducted in the mining triangle (RACCN) and the departments of Chontales, Chinandega and León.*

*The technical expert from UNITAR visited the country in April 2022 to support the local team of the MEM on the information collection and review.*

*The MINSA has started the information collection and a capacity building programme on mercury and health is currently under preparation.*

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

*Several work meetings with industrial sectors and regulatory stakeholders were conducted to estimate the mercury emissions and releases in the country.*

*MARENA conducted awareness raising events on the impacts of mercury in Villanueva (64 participant, 54 men and 10 women) and capacity building activities in the delegations of Chinandega, Matagalpa (105 participants, 56 men and 49 women), Nueva Segovia and Managua (93 participants, 56 men and 38 women).*

*MEM conducted three (3) meetings at the department level to present the NAP and its objectives (395 participants, 118 women and 277 men) and six (6) awareness raising meetings in La Libertad, Santo Domingo, Villanueva, Chinandega, Santa Rosa del Peñón, Kisilala and Muelle de los Bueyes (797 participants, 565 men and 232 women).*

*MINSA conducted six (6) local workshops targeting health personnel working in ASGM areas in coordination with the SILAIS (Local Integrated HealthCare System). Up to date, 33 interviews to miners were carried out (185 participants, 73 women and 112 men), 46 interviews to different stakeholders were conducted (58 participants, 17 women and 41 men) and 14 health centers and 3 regional hospitals were assessed.*

*One of the reported challenges has been the reluctance of miners to facilitate information due to the fear of being prosecuted. Mitigation measures have been introduced to increase the trust and engagement with the project.*

**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-mainstreaming is taken into account in the terms of reference (ToR) for recruiting personnel under the project and gender is balanced across both the PMU and the Project Steering Committee (ITC in Spanish).*

*MARENA uses a digital platform named SISEA (Sistema de Seguimiento a la Educación Ambiental) where the data from projects is recorded with a special emphasis on sex-disaggregated indicators to*

*track the participation of women in capacity building, decision making and others.*

*Additionally, as part of the baseline data collection under the NAP, data on women in ASGM is being gathered and analyzed (for example: roles and tasks, access to resources, participation in decision making...).*

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

*Trainings with the technical personnel and the members of the ITC are frequently organized. In that sense, 23 people from public institutions successfully completed the MercuryLearn training.*

*Awareness raising materials on the Minamata Convention, good mining practices and technologies, and the impacts of mercury have been prepared (brochures, banners, infographics).*

*A portal and a website have been developed by MARENA and UNITAR respectively to share the progress and achievements under the project.*

## II. Minor Amendments

1. Please briefly elaborate on any **minor amendments**<sup>4</sup> 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 until the end of 2022 due to the 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

<sup>4</sup> 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%.

### III. Project Risk Management

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

*COVID-19 had an impact in the project during the first half of 2021 as meetings could not be organized in-person and international travel was restricted. During the reporting period, this impact has been mitigated as face-to-face meetings have been resumed applying the necessary safety and health protocols.*

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

*The project has been facing delays in the implementation due to the impact of COVID-19 pandemic and a lack of coordination among the key institutions.*

*An extension was requested until the end of 2022 based on the request of the Inter-Institutional Technical Committee (ITC).*

## 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	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	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".
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	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.
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	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.
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	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.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	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.
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	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)	
<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	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".
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	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.
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Implementation of <u>some</u> components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	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.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Implementation of <u>most</u> components is <u>not</u> in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	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:	
<b>High Risk (H)</b>	There is a probability of greater than <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
<b>Substantial Risk (S)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>51%</b> and <b>75%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks.
<b>Moderate Risk (M)</b>	There is a probability of between <b>26%</b> and <b>50%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.

<b>Low Risk (L)</b>	There is a probability of up to <b>25%</b> that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.
---------------------	--