



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR DIRECT ACCESS TO ENABLING ACTIVITY

GEF ID:	<b>5871</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Nigeria</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Minamata Convention Initial Assessment in the Federal Republic of Nigeria</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>\$1,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$182,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$1,182,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ibrahima Sow</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Ludovic Bernaudat</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes. Nigeria has signed the Minamata Convention on 10 October 2013.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? * <sup>1</sup>	The proposal includes two letters of endorsement. The one dated 1 April 2014 indicates an amount of \$330,000, which is not consistent with the proposed project budget. Please remove this letter from the project documentation.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? *	Yes. UNIDO has a good track record in the implementation of EA proposals in the Chemicals Focal area.
	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):	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>NA</p> <p>Yes. A justification of the requested amount which exceeds the threshold is provided</p>

<sup>1</sup> Questions 2, 3, 4, 18 and 19 are applicable only to EAs submitted through Agencies.  
EA review template: updated June 7 2011

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	• focal area set-aside?	Yes.
Project Consistency	6. Is the project aligned with the focal areas results framework?	Yes
	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.
	9. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes.
	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.
	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,
Project Financing	14. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes
	15. Is the itemized budget (including consultant fees, travel, office facilities, etc) justified?	Yes.
	16. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, 8.5 % is within guidelines
	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?	Co-financing is not a requirement. However Nigeria will contribute \$ 182,000 to the project.
	19. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?*	Yes, UNIDO is cotributing \$ 11,000 in kind

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	20. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for financial management and procurement assessment.	
Agency Responses	21. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:*	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>	None received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>	None received
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>	None received

Secretariat Recommendation		
Recommendation	<b>22. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	Not at this time. Please address comment under section 2
Review Date (s)	First review**	June 08, 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.**