

**CONVENTION ON WETLANDS (Ramsar, Iran, 1971)**

Rue Mauverney 28, CH-1196 Gland, Switzerland

Tel. +41-22-999-0170, Fax +41-22-999-0169

E-mail: [asia.oceania@ramsar.org](mailto:asia.oceania@ramsar.org)Web site: [www.ramsar.org](http://www.ramsar.org)**Nagao Wetland Fund (NWF)****Section D****Project Proposal Assessment Form***[for the Convention Secretariat use]***SUMMARY**

Country:			
Project code:	NWF/year/country initials/consecutive number of multiple projects submitted by the country NWF/year/ /		
Project Title:			
Has the project been submitted previously?	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
If YES, how was it assessed? Feasible or feasible with minor improvements:	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
Score:			
If part of a larger project, what is the total cost of the overall project:	USD		
Amount requested from NWF:	USD		
Additional counterpart financial contribution from proposer:	USD		
In-kind support being provided from proposer:	USD		
Additional financial contribution(s) from other in-country sources:	USD		
Additional financial contribution(s) from other sources external to the country:	USD		
In-kind support being provided from other sources:	USD		
<b>Total Project Budget</b>	<b>USD</b>		
⇒ Project was assessed as feasible	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	
OR feasible subject to minor improvements (Stage I)	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input type="radio"/> No	

**Primary reasons for the score given:**

## Assessment Procedure

The assessment procedure considers the feasibility of the project by reviewing the objectives, proposed activities and outputs, budgetary information and the capacity of the proposer to complete the project. If it is the overall conclusion of the Secretariat that the project does not meet expectations of the review, it will not be further considered.

### Review of objectives, methodology, budgetary and capacity information

In the following review, the questions are intended to help the reviewer to determine if the project has appropriate objectives, proposes to apply suitable methods and activities, has a clearly prepared and appropriate budget, the proposer has the necessary capacity to carry out the project, and the project is therefore feasible. The reviewer should indicate Yes or No in response to each question in sections A, B, C, and D, and then in Section E indicate an overall assessment about the feasibility of the project based on the assessments in the foregoing sections. If there are more than two “No” responses given in a section (A-D), this section will be assessed as “No”. In Section E, if there are at least two “No”, then serious consideration needs to be given to rating the project as unsuitable.

<b>A. Objectives and outputs: are the objectives and beneficiaries well defined?</b>	
1. Is the background of the project satisfactory?	Yes / No
2. Are the justification and beneficiaries of the project clearly explained?	Yes / No
3. Is (are) the problem(s) to be addressed identified?	Yes / No
4. Are the general objectives clearly related to Operational Objectives of the Convention Strategic Plan?	Yes / No
5. Are the specific objectives clearly defined?	Yes / No
6. Is there an output indicated for each objective?	Yes / No
7. Are the outputs suitable to achieve the objectives?	Yes / No
<b>Assessment – the beneficiaries, objectives and outputs are well defined</b>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
<b>B. Activities: are the activities for achieving the objectives well defined and appropriate?</b>	
1. Are the activities described adequately?	Yes / No
2. Are the methods for undertaking each activity described clearly?	Yes / No
3. Are the activities proposed appropriate to attain the indicated output?	Yes / No
4. Are the different stakeholders described adequately? (including of gender perspectives is encouraged.)	Yes / No
5. Does the project include monitoring and evaluation procedures to ensure that the objectives are met?	Yes / No
6. Is the work plan described adequately?	Yes / No
7. Is the work plan appropriate to attain the indicated outputs?	Yes / No
<b>Assessment – the methods proposed for achieving the objectives are suitable</b>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
<b>C. Suitability of the budget and adequacy of information on budgeting</b>	
1. Is there a budget with itemized lists of costs?	Yes / No
2. Does the budget provide justification for each budget item?	Yes / No
3. Is the proposed budget appropriate for the activities envisaged?	Yes / No

4. Where applicable, does the budget distinguish between amounts to be covered by the NWF grant and amounts with confirmed (or proposed) financing by other sources (either cash or in-kind contributions)?	Yes / No
<b>Assessment – the budget information is adequate and the proposed budget appropriate</b>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

<b>D. Capacities needed to see the project completed:</b>	
1. Is a project management structure defined, so that it is clear who is responsible for the various aspects of the proposal?	Yes / No
2. Does the proposed executor of the project have the institutional and technical capacity to carry out the project?	Yes / No
3. Given the current political and administrative environment in the country, is the assessor confident of the project being completed?	Yes / No
<b>Assessment – the capacity information indicates that the project should be able to proceed</b>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

<b>E Overall assessment - Project feasibility:</b>	
On balance does the project meet the expected standards under Sections:	
A (Objectives),	Yes / No
B (Activities and methods),	Yes / No
C (Budget),	Yes / No
D (Capacity)	Yes / No
Based on the above ratings this project is:	
<b>feasible</b>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>feasible subject to minor improvements</b>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>not feasible</b>	<input type="radio"/>

*If the overall assessment indicates that the project is not feasible, then it will not be further considered.*