



Enabling Activity Project Implementation Report

(01 July 2021 – 30 June 2022)

Project Title:	National action plan on mercury in the artisanal and small-scale gold mining sector in Angola
GEF ID:	10135
UNIDO ID:	180266
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	GEF-7
Country(ies)	Angola
Region:	AFR - Africa
GEF Focal Area:	Chemicals and Waste (CW)
Implementing Department/Division:	ENV / MCM
Executing Agency(ies):	UNITAR and Ministry of Environment: Ministério do Ambiente (MINAMB), Angola
Project Duration (months):	24
Extension(s):	1
GEF Project Financing:	500,000
Agency Fee:	47,500
Co-financing Amount:	58,500
Date of EA Approval:	3/4/2019
UNIDO Approval Date:	4/26/2019
Actual Implementation Start Date:	3/6/2019
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2022:	416,840.88
Original Project Completion Date:	9/30/2021
Project Completion Date as reported in FY21:	8/31/2021
Current SAP Completion Date:	9/30/2022
Expected Project Completion Date:	12/15/2022
Expected Financial Closure Date:	1/15/2023
UNIDO Project Manager ¹ :	Ozunimi ITI

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. 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>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>
<i>While delays have been experienced, there is a strong interest and commitment of the Government of Angola to work on mercury-related matters and implement its obligations in relation to the Minamata Convention on mercury. The GEO of the project will be eventually achieved with the submission of the NAP reports to the secretariat of the Minamata Convention.</i>		
Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (S)</i>
<i>The activities are being implemented, and some of the deliverables have already been submitted. However, some activities are still facing delays.</i>		
Overall Risk Rating	<i>Low Risk (L)</i>	<i>Low Risk (L)</i>
<i>The coordination among stakeholders and the lack of awareness continue to be a challenge that could pose additional delays in the submission of reports. The political environment due to a recent contested election, is affecting the implementation of the activities.</i>		

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

As indicated in the previous PIR, the project brought about some unforeseen challenges due to COVID-19, as the project has a direct link to health professionals and institutions. These institutions were principally focusing their efforts on the pandemic countrywide, leading to an extended period of consultation that was not foreseen initially.

During this reporting period, the main progress has been (i) the development of a comprehensive national analysis of the ASGM sector to support the development and implementation of a road map to prevent and reduce mercury use, emissions and releases, and (ii) the elaboration of a draft document of the NAP for Angola.

Considering that no evidence of the use of mercury on the ASGM sites was found during the fieldwork,

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

actions and strategies in the NAP will be focused on prevention to ensure that mercury will not be used in those ASGM sites in the future.

Some adjustments and refinements are still needed to ensure the NAP follows the guidance of the Secretariat and UNEP guidelines. A National Steering Group meeting is still to be organised to present the NAP and its results and collect feedback from national and local stakeholders.

During the fieldwork, there were several challenges, which required adapting the initial planning. For instance, the methodology of face-to-face interviews had to be adapted. The questionnaires were too long and detailed; therefore, there was not enough time to review all questions during the interviews. In some cases, more than one day was needed to complete the activity. As an alternative, the questionnaires were shortened, and group discussions were organised, especially when the interviews were carried out with stakeholders from the same area of interest. In such cases, the group discussions were an alternative to carrying out the interview in a timely manner.

Difficulties in accessing the ASGM sites were also reported by the consultants. Some sites needed support from the local police forces to access those areas. This also impacted the number of days previously scheduled for the fieldwork. Considering the difficulties in reaching those areas, in some of the visits, more than one day was needed to carry out the interviews.

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

As indicated in the previous PIR, MINAMB has demonstrated strong leadership and government ownership, involving other government institutions on a regular basis.

There were challenges in obtaining the relevant information, as it was initially difficult to engage with relevant stakeholders in the mining sector. However, all interviews and surveys were successfully carried out, especially with local authorities and at provincial and municipal levels.

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 activities have been considered throughout the project implementation. During this reporting period, local institutions dealing with gender issues were involved in every activity, trying to incorporate and address gender-specific activities in the ASGM sector. In addition, both female and male consultants were recruited in the national teams conducting the fieldwork.

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 during the visits to the local health facilities were frequently organised.

After the fieldwork, several documents and tools were developed to analyse the collected data and to reflect the findings, e.g., SWOT analysis and field report, database of the interview conducted in Caala, Chicala, Belize and Buzo-Zau and the inventory database.

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

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).

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%.

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	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Components and Cost	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Management	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Implementation Schedule	Due to COVID-19, there was a need to reestablish a new work plan
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Executing Entity Category	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Minor Project Objective Change	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Safeguards	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk Analysis	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Co-Financing	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Location of Project Activities	Some meetings had to be organised online instead of face-to-face
<input type="checkbox"/>	Others	

III. Project Risk Management

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

The outbreak of COVID-19 affected the project implementation because it erupted precisely when the project started. The inception work shop and other stakeholders' meetings were carried out online. In addition, there was some delay in the fieldwork due to the social restriction becoming a bit flexible. So, COVID-19 has implications on the project's ability to finish by the expected completion date. This is why an extension was agreed upon between UNIDO and the MINAMB.

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

The extension was already requested and agreed. The project is expected to be completed according to the new schedule.

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.