



## GEF-6 GEF Secretariat Review For Enabling Activity Proposal

GEF ID:	<b>9152</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Nepal</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Minamata Initial Assessment in Nepal</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNIDO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Chemicals and Waste</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$200,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$108,600</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$308,600</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ogawa Masako</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Ludovic Bernaudat</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	MO June 12, 2015 Yes. Nepal signed the Convention in October 2013.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	MO June 12, 2015 Yes.	
Project Consistency	3. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?	MO June 12, 2015 Yes. The project will assist Nepal in assessing its situation in relation to Mercury to enable them to take further actions related to the Minamata Convention.	
	4. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	MO June 12, 2015 Yes. Nepal has been under the process of formulating regulation for the management of mercury.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	conventions?		
Project Design	5. Are the components in Table A sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MO June 12, 2015 Yes.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MO June 12, 2015 Yes.	
	7. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	MO June 12, 2015 Yes.	
	8. Is indicated cofinancing appropriate for an enabling activity?	MO June 12, 2015 Yes.	
Other Comments	9. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for the financial management and procurement assessment <sup>1</sup> .		
Resource Availability	10. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?	MO June 12, 2015 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• The focal area set-aside?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation	<b>11. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	MO June 12, 2015 Yes.	
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 12, 2015	

<sup>1</sup> Question 9 is applicable only to direct access proposal while question 10 (on fees) is not applicable to direct access proposal.  
EA review template: updated Feb2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

**\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.**