

**United Nations Development Programme
Guyana
Quarterly Progress Report**

Project # & Title: 00092906, Minamata Initial Assessment for Guyana

Date: 06/01/2016

Reporting Period: Q4 (October- December, 2015)

Implementing Agency: MNR

Responsible Agency: MNR

I. Output Assessment

Output (extract output from AWP for reporting period)	Indicators (extract indicators for Outputs being reported on as recorded in AWP)	Quarterly Target (s)(extract from AWP)	Results Achieved (per output for the reporting period. This should include a description of targets achieved in the quarter)	Delivery Rate (actual expenditures/Disbursements received)*100	Challenges (state difficulties encountered in implementing activities)	Risks & Issues (check risk and issues log and report on risk encountered during the quarter)
		Q = 4				
Output 1. Output 1.1: National Mercury Coordination/consultation Mechanism established in Guyana.	Output 1.1: Indicators: A national decision-making structure on mercury ("Mercury Coordination/Consultation Mechanism (MCM)") established	Target 1: Annual targets: Institutional capacities amongst key stakeholders built	A Project Board Meeting was held on 17 Dec, 2015. The Project Board Members are acting in the capacity of the MCM until defined by the IP.	22%	Without a regulatory framework on Hg, it was difficult to identify the key stakeholders that would comprise an MCM.	none
Output 1.2: Assessment report prepared on the existing and required policy and regulatory framework as well as institutional capacity to implement the Convention for Guyana (incl. overview of existing barriers).	Output 1.2: Indicators: Assessment Report finalized.	Target 2: Institutional capacities, and the policy and regulatory framework in place to management Mercury, assessed, gaps and needs identified. Barriers that would hinder implementation of the Convention identified.	A Mercury Policy and Regulatory Advisor was procured and an Assessment report was prepared. At the conclusion of Q4, the report was not finalised. Additionally, a Meeting and Workshop Facilitator was procured and Reports on the meetings, held by the Mercury Policy and	10% 10%	The Board Members did not provide feedback on this report, hence, feedback had to be sought from the Legal Officer of the EPA.	none

Output (extract output from AWP for reporting period)	Indicators (extract indicators for Outputs being reported on as recorded in AWP)	Quarterly Target (s)(extract from AWP)	Results Achieved (per output for the reporting period. This should include a description of targets achieved in the quarter)	Delivery Rate (actual expenditures/Disbursements received)*100	Challenges (state difficulties encountered in implementing activities)	Risks & Issues (check risk and issues log and report on risk encountered during the quarter)
		Q = 4				
			Regulatory Adviser, were completed. At the conclusion of Q4, the report was not finalised.			
<p>Output 2.</p> <p>Output 2.1.1: Capacity built and training conducted to a group of national technical experts to conduct and develop National Mercury Profile.</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: Capacity built and training conducted to target key government representatives to facilitate revision process on Mercury Inventory.</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1 & 2.1.2: Indicators: National technical experts (national technical experts and Mercury Focus Group members) trained on data collection methodologies, reliability, and credibility and data analysis.</p>	<p>Target 1</p> <p>Annual targets: National technical experts trained to be able to undertake the Mercury Inventory. Mercury Focus Group members trained to be able to review the Mercury Inventory.</p>	<p>A Mercury Inventory Specialist and a National Data Collection Technician were procured to conduct training. However, the training was planned for 2015, but was postponed to January, 2016.</p>	10%	<p>Due to the Christmas seasons where most officers were on annual leave, the PB advised that the training be set for the 3rd week in January, 2016.</p>	none
<p>Output 2.2.2: A National Mercury Profile prepared for review, approval and adoption by the MCM</p>	<p>Indicator: Mercury profile prepared.</p>	<p>Target 2</p> <p>Methodology and work programme submitted and approved by the project board.</p> <p>Mercury Inventory (Level 2) completed, incl.: Overview of emission and releases sources Inventory of wastes (stockpiles and generation rates) Assessment of current practices to manage mercury Identification of main risk groups</p>	<p>A Mercury Inventory Specialist and a National Data Collection Technician were procured. Because procurements were completed in late November, 2015, reports would be completed in January, 2016.</p> <p>Data collection for a Mercury Inventory was completed.</p>	<p>10%</p> <p>100%</p>	<p>The procurement of the consultants to complete this component was completed in late November, 2015, hence, deliverables will be submitted in February, 2016</p>	none

Output (extract output from AWP for reporting period)	Indicators (extract indicators for Outputs being reported on as recorded in AWP)	Quarterly Target (s)(extract from AWP)	Results Achieved (per output for the reporting period. This should include a description of targets achieved in the quarter)	Delivery Rate (actual expenditures/Disbursements received)*100	Challenges (state difficulties encountered in implementing activities)	Risks & Issues (check risk and issues log and report on risk encountered during the quarter)
		Q = 4				
Output 2.3: A National MIA Report prepared by the national project team	Indicator: National MIA Report in the process of preparation.	<p>Target 1: MIA Report in preparation, containing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Institutional structures available to implement the Convention. -Barriers for implementation of the Convention. -Summary of Mercury Profile. -Identification of technical and financial needs for implementation of the Convention. -Inventory of wastes (stockpiles and generation rates) -Proposal for action. -Recommendations for policy and regulatory revisions. 	<p>A Mercury Inventory Specialist and a National Data Collection Technician were procured. Because procurements were completed in late November, 2015, reports would be completed in January, 2016.</p> <p>Data collection for a Mercury Inventory was completed.</p>	<p>10%</p> <p>100%</p>	The procurement of the consultants to complete this component was completed in late November, 2015, hence, deliverables will be submitted in February, 2016	none
Output 3. Project Management: Project is coordinated throughout the implementation period by a local project coordinator	<p>Indicator 1: A training is carried out for a project coordinator</p> <p>Indicator 2: activity results 1.1 to 2.3 are delivered</p>	<p>Target 1 Ensuring sound communication with international and local consultants, and assuring to bring their activity results based on the timeframe indicated in AWP</p>	<p>A Project Associate was procured on 02 November, 2015. Sound communication with all consultants was executed and delivery of planned activities were ensured.</p> <p>Training was done for the Project Associate in understanding the Minamata Convention</p>	47%	The entire budgeted DPC was not utilized, since, the Project Associate was hired in November, 2015 instead of April, 2015.	none

II. Capacity Development (Please explain how project activities have contributed to improving institutional policies, systems, strategies and structures. Give specific example of actions undertaken and the results achieved)

The MIA project is a NIM project, thus, the input of the Implementing Partner (IP) in the decision making process is very important. In this regard, regular communication with partners, by mails, phone calls and meetings, was established to involve all focal points in the decisions making process, concerning the project activities. This led to the project associate widening his scope of knowledge in project management that contributed significantly to the execution of the project activities.

III. Gender Mainstreaming (how did project serve men and women, identify # of men/women served)

One female and two males from the GGMC and a female and a male from the EPA, were given an insight into collecting data for a Mercury inventory Level 1 in the field.

IV. Lessons Learnt: (Please describe new understanding or insights gained from project activities that can contribute to improving future project design and implementation. Give specific examples)

The project document should be explicit. In the MIA project the roles of the entities that were involved in the project were not clear. This led to an initial misunderstanding that the DNRE was only a supplier to the project and should not take other responsibilities. Additionally, it was made clear that feedback from the Project Board members would be much more forthcoming if members are paid a stipend.

V. Innovative Initiatives: (Please describe new/pioneering actions (internal or external) taken during the year that contributed to the project being effective. Effectiveness here can be taken to mean improving practice or processes that aided positive project achievements).

Rather than waiting on the IP for correspondence. It was much more effective to: firstly, draft letter, forward to the IP for approval, then uplift such from the IP. This process was less time consuming and ensured that procedures of the UNDP were done in a timely manner.

VI. Reports & Publications: (Please describe any reports or publications to which information from this project would have contributed).

Nil.