



Enabling Activity Project Implementation Report

(01 July 2022 - 30 June 2023)

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 2023:	474,033.12
Original Project Completion Date:	9/30/2021
Project Completion Date as reported in FY22:	12/15/2022
Current SAP Completion Date:	9/30/2023
Expected Project Completion Date:	6/15/2023

Expected Financial Closure Date:	6/30/2024
UNIDO Project Manager¹:	Ms. Ozunimi ITI

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	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)

While delays have been experienced, the Government of Angola has a strong interest and commitment to work on mercury-related matters and implement its obligations to the Minamata Convention on mercury. Stakeholders have actively participated in the different activities and have coordinated all activities with key stakeholders. The NAP report is being finalized and will be validated by the Project Steering Committee in August 2023.

Implementation Progress (IP) Rating	Satisfactory (S)	Satisfactory (S)
The activities have been in	mplemented, and final deliverables ha	ve been produced. A comprehensiv

The activities have been implemented, and final deliverables have been produced. A comprehensive review process has been taken nationally, including key institutions and stakeholders.

Overall Risk Rating	Low Risk (L)	Low Risk (L)
---------------------	--------------	--------------

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 report.

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 team was focused on organising the data and information gathered during the field visits in Cabinda and Huambo provinces and drafting the chapters of the NAP. The major challenge was to adapt the NAP to the finding of the field visits, as no mercury was found in ASGM sites.

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

¹ Person responsible for report content

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

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 will still be organised to present the NAP and its results and collect feedback from national and local stakeholders.

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.

A hybrid consultation meeting was held with the national coordination and the National Steering Group, where the NAP was presented. On this occasion, national and local stakeholders had the opportunity to comment, understand the field visits' findings, get familiar with the NAP chapters, and propose suggestions.

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 were considered at the project design level and will be taken into account throughout the project implementation.

The project gives equal opportunities to both genders and is not seen to be favouring or disadvantaging any of the genders. Some of the team leaders in the established task teams are females buttressing the fact that both genders are capable of leadership.

The gender-responsive measures have been incorporated as a cross-cutting approach throughout the NAP chapters and also project activities, specifically on Overview, National Objectives, Implementation Strategy, and Workplan. More specifically, the NAP has identified the following women-specific measures to address gender equality and women's empowerment:

- Establishing mechanisms for indiscriminate access by mining women to land;
- Facilitating women's leadership roles in mining entities and allowing them to establish their entities:
- Training of established mining entities in gender equality and participatory governance (formalization strategy);
- Recognizing the role and importance of women in ASGM and integrating gender issues into the Angolan Mining Code (law n. 31/11) in accordance with the obligations of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women;
- Training women on gold valuation, gold trading and value addition and include them in supply chain restructuring discussions;
- Improving women's financial literacy and knowledge of available financial products and facilitating their access to finance, including through microcredit cooperatives and the establishment of savings and loan groups (formalization strategy).
- **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.

The team elaborated the Rapid Health Situation Assessment on ASGM sites as part of the Public Health Strategy guided by WHO. This document aims at supporting the country to deliver appropriate and efficient responses to health issues to the ASGM community.

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

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.

Results Framework	NA
Components and Cost	NA
Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	NA
Financial Management	NA
Implementation Schedule	NA
Executing Entity	NA
Executing Entity Category	NA
Minor Project Objective Change	NA
Safeguards	NA
Risk Analysis	NA
Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	NA
Co-Financing	NA
Location of Project Activities	NA
Others	NA

III. Project Risk Management

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

During the reporting period, there were no impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the progress of the project.

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.

IV. GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

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%.

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

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

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 access 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) project may face only low risks.	I I OW RISK (I)	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.
---	------------------	--