



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	<b>5866</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Armenia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Minamata Convention Initial Assessment (MIA) in the Republic of Armenia</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNIDO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>POPs</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$200,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$22,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$222,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Evelyn Swain</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>JÃ©rÃ©me Stucki</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Armenia signed the convention.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * <sup>1</sup>	Yes.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	Yes.
	4. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? *	Yes.
Resource Availability	5. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes.
	• focal area set-aside?	
	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Yes.

<sup>1</sup> Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency	7. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal areas objectives identified?	Yes.
	8. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Yes, this is an enabling activity.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes, this is an mercury initial assessment.
	10. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	Yes.
	11. Is there a clear description of how gender dimensions are being considered in the project design and implementation?	Yes, gender is included.
	12. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes.
	13. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.
	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.
Project Financing	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	Yes.
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.
	17. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.
	18. Is indicated co-financing appropriate for an enabling activity?	Yes, co-financing is not required.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	Yes.
	20. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for financial management and procurement assessment.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Agency Responses	21. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	• STAP?	none
	• Convention Secretariat?	none
	• Other GEF Agencies?	none

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	Yes, clearance is recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review**	June 04, 2014
	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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**