



Enabling Activity Project Implementation Report

(01 July 2022 – 30 June 2023)

Project Title:	Minamata Initial Assessment and National action plan on the Artisanal and Smal-scale gold mining sector in Nicaragua
GEF ID:	10148
UNIDO ID:	190004
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	GEF-7
Country(ies)	Nicaragua
Region:	LAC - Latin America and Caribbean
GEF Focal Area:	Chemicals and Waste (CW)
Implementing Department/Division:	ENV / MCM
Executing Agency(ies):	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 (CNRcST), and UNITAR
Project Duration (months):	24
Extension(s):	1
GEF Project Financing:	700,000 USD
Agency Fee:	66,500 USD
Co-financing Amount:	30,00 USD
Date of EA Approval:	1/30/2020
UNIDO Approval Date:	4/3/2020
Actual Implementation Start Date:	4/3/2020
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2023:	679444.72 USD
Original Project Completion Date:	12/1/2021
Project Completion Date as reported in FY22:	12/31/2022
Current SAP Completion Date:	6/30/2023

Expected Project Completion Date:	12/31/2023
Expected Financial Closure Date:	12/31/2024
UNIDO Project Manager¹:	<i>Ms. Lamia Benabbas</i>

I. Overview of project status

Overall Ratings²	FY23	FY22
Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) Rating	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>
<i>The MIA and NAP reports are finalized</i>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>
<i>Activities have been implemented and final deliverables have been produced. A comprehensive review process has taken nationally and included key institutions and stakeholders. The project has requested an extension until the end of 2023 to conduct the Final Evaluation. The Project Team was informed on 28.06.2023 by the Evaluation Team that the Final Evaluation is to be carried out by the Project Team, and therefore, the request for another extension was required.</i>		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Low Risk (L)</i>	<i>Moderate Risk (M)</i>
<i>The risks presented in the last PIR report have been mitigated and in the last year of the implementation institutions worked closely to produce the final reports.</i>		

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

<p><i>During the reporting period, the National Coordination Team and players achieved the development of the MIA and NAP reports and their respective consultation process with key stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>The following documents have been finalized:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Minamata Initial Assessment</i> • <i>National Action Plan on ASGM</i> • <i>Study of the Legal Framework</i> • <i>MIA Inventory</i> • <i>Quick Health Assessment</i> • <i>National Assessment of the institutional capacity to develop a national health strategy</i> • <i>National Scoping Study on ASGM</i> <p><i>The final workshop was held in Managua on 17 May 2023 and it included key stakeholders and Ministers involved in the development of the Mercury MIA and ASGM NAP in Nicaragua.</i></p>
--

¹ Person responsible for report content

² 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

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

In March 2023, MEM held 9 events to disseminate the Results obtained from the assessments conducted under the MIA and NAP reports. The events were held in the municipalities of Villanueva (Chinandega), Santa Rosa del Peñón (León), La Libertad and Santo Domingo (Chontales), El Rama (Kisilala) and Muelle de los Bueyes (Autonomous Region of the South Caribbean Coast), Bonanza, Rosita and Siuna (Autonomous Region of the North Caribbean Coast). In addition, State Institutions and National, Departmental and Municipal Authorities, Mining Concessionaires, Mining Cooperatives, Property Owners, BMR Owners and Independent Miners also participated in this activity. The presentations were carried out by the members of the ITC.

MINSA conducted six (6) local workshops on occupational risks with the participation of 138 men and 116 women.

During the reporting period, MARENA held meetings and workshops in different ASM sites or communities to address risks of poisoning in the ASM population due to the use of mercury, to present the preliminary results on mercury data in the country and the identified action priorities and their relationship with the Environmental Assessment System. These events were held with the participation of artisanal miners, public and private sectors and the population in general, providing materials for training on awareness of mercury.

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 has been taken into account in the terms of reference (ToR) for recruiting personnel under the project and gender was balanced across both the PMU and the ITC.

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.

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

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

All the relevant documents and presentations with national stakeholders and partners are available on the project portal and website developed by UNITAR and MARENA. Additionally, workshops on ASGM estimates and evaluation of results were conducted with the NAP drafting team.

II. Minor Amendments

1. Please briefly elaborate on any **minor amendments**³ to the approved project that may have been introduced during the reporting period or indicate as not applicable (NA).

<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	

³ 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%.

		NA
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	The project has requested an extension until the end of 2023 to conduct the Final Evaluation. The project has requested an extension until the end of 2023 to conduct the Final Evaluation. The Project Team was informed on 28.06.2023 by the Evaluation Team that the Final Evaluation is to be carried out by the Project Team, and therefore, the request for another extension was required.
<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 had an impact on the activities particularly in 2021 as meetings could not be organized in-person and international travel was restricted. However, in the second half of 2022 and first half of 2023, the project activities progressed well and the project could be concluded.

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

An extension has been requested until the end of 2023 to conduct final evaluation. The project has requested an extension until the end of 2023 to conduct the Final Evaluation. The Project Team was informed on 28.06.2023 by the Evaluation Team that the Final Evaluation is to be carried out by the Project Team, and therefore, the request for another extension was required.

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
Managua		12.09681	-86.24482		

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

- Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period, i.e. 1 July 2022 – 30 June 2023.
- Responsibility:** The responsibility for preparing the report lies with the project manager in consultation with the division chief and director.
- 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.
- 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.