



Global Partnership for Mitigation of Underwater Noise from Shipping (GloNoise Partnership)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10890

Countries

Global

Project Name

Global Partnership for Mitigation of Underwater Noise from Shipping (GloNoise Partnership)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

10/6/2021

Review completed by PM

6/12/2022

Program Manager

Taylor Henshaw

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information**Focal area elements**

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): No,

1) Please tighten the Project Objective to a single, concise sentence.

2) The investment mention and list a number of national activities in five countries, co-financing leveraged from five countries, however, the submission includes no LOEs.

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed. The identification of LPCs and securing respective LOEs will happen in the PPG phase. The LPC selection criteria is present in the Stakeholders section of the submission. This is in line with previously GEF-funded Glo-X projects

Agency Response

UNDP Responses 1 June 2022

Response to (1):

? The project objectives sharpened and shortened as per the above recommendation.

Response to (2):

? IMO cannot identify Lead Pilot Countries (LPCs) and provide Letters of Endorsement (LOEs) at the PIF stage. This is due to the decision making process at IMO and selection of LPCs that must go through an open and transparent system of public announcement and call for expressions of interest to join in. This could only happen when the project idea is firm, i.e, after the PIF stage.

? In-line with other IMO Glo-X family of projects that have been funded by GEF in the past, the identification of LPCs and securing their LOEs will be carried out at the PPG phase of the project through a call for Expressions of Interest and wide ranging consultations.

As such, the full details of LPCs, and their LOEs will be submitted as part of the full Project Document (ProDoc).

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): No.

1) Please recast the outputs, and make them quantifiable. Developed, rolled out and implemented is not clear enough. Please include reference to the GEF Core Indicators the project will contribute in Table B to the extent possible.

2) There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution to PMC is kept at 8.97% (\$175,000) of the total project cost (\$1,950,000), for a co-financing of \$8,611,500, the expected contribution to PMC must be \$772,452 instead of \$611,500 (which is 7.1%). Please adjust accordingly.

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Not addressed. There is still not proportionality between the GEF financing and co-financing contribution to PMC.

11th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Responses, 1 June 2022

Response to (1):

? The Outputs were revisited and re-formulated. They were made more specific and quantifiable to the extent possible.

? All GloNoise Components supports Core Indicator 11 and indirectly and over long term will support Core Indicator 5 on stress reduction in sea areas.

Response to (2):

? The adjustments to co-financing were made according to the above recommendations.

Now, the GEF contribution to PMC is 8.97% and the co-financing contribution is 9.23%.

UNDP Response 8 June 2022

? On (2), further adjustment made to have the proportionality as close as possible.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): No, please address following points:

1) If letters of indicative co-finance are not available and the names of co-financiers need to remain vague at PIF stage, to achieve an adequate evidentiary threshold please better explain the calculations for the estimated costs for both investment mobilized and recurrent expenditures (i.e., more specificity on how the \$1,260,000 figure is reached for governments participating at IMO MEPC meetings; etc.).

2) For Governments participating at IMO MEPC meetings: are these costs covered by the governments themselves or by IMO? "Donor Agency?" seems to wrongly describing the recipient governments. Please make sure there is consistency between the descriptions and the entities.

3) ?Civil Society Organizations? as a source of co-finance does not match ?centers of excellence, knowledge organizations and governmental agencies and other strategic partners?. Please disaggregate further to fit with label.

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) The description how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified must be filled in. Please move relevant Section 1.5 details to the field below Table C. In this section, please also describe who the Strategic Partners are.

(2) Not addressed. The "Governments participating at IMO MEPC meetings" is still labeled "Donor Agency" in Table C. Please change to "Other", which is most appropriate for governments that are not project recipient country governments.

(3) Not addressed. The Grant/Investment Mobilized (\$8,000) for CSO still reads "Centers of excellence/Knowledge Organizations/NGOs/Governmental agencies and other strategic partners" in Table C. Please adjust accordingly.

11th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

14th of June 2022 (thenshaw): On co-financing: Among all the reported co-financiers, besides IMO and UNDP, all the rest entity names are unknown. Please identify names of the potential co-financiers. If it's too early to identify/disclose the entities, please remove the entries. At CEO endorsement request, please report them as confirmed co-financing.

15th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Responses, 1 June 2022

Response to (1):

- ? As discussed earlier (**Section 1** above), the identification of LPCs will be carried out as part of an open system of inviting governments to take part in the project during the PPG phase, in-line with previous practice under Glo-X family of projects. The plan is to select 5 countries; one from each region as described in the PIF.
- ? On specific aspect of numerical value of Investment Mobilized by governments taking part in IMO debates as well as the LPCs, detailed calculation methods are given in **Section 1.5** of the PIF that now also includes further explanations of how they are derived.

Response to (2):

- ? Yes, the costs attributed to IMO member governments are paid by the governments themselves as a matter of routine when they take part in IMO meetings.
- ? For consistency, instead of "Donor Agency", the category "Recipient Country Government" was assigned.

Response to (3):

"Civil Society Organizations" has been disaggregated and now only represent NGOs. Other sources of co-financing mainly from Global Strategic Partners are represented by category "other" in the table.

UNDP Response 8 June 2022

Response to (1)

- Section 1.5 moved totally and inserted under Table C.
- A footnote added to explain the Strategic Partners. Please note Strategic Partners are defined in few occasions in the PIF.

Response to (2)

- ? Table C updated accordingly.

Response (3)

? In fact, this was not the case on previous version (not sure why it has been picked up?).

Anyway, it was double checked and adjusted accordingly.

UNDP Response, 15 June 2022

All the anticipated cofinancers that could not be fully specified at this stage (e.g. LPCs, Global Industry Alliance members, Global Strategic Partners member) were removed. Only IMO, UNDP and IMO Member States were retained. The other ones, especially LPCs, will be added at PPG phase when they are fully identified and consulted.

All explanatory notes related to removed co-financiers were also deleted.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 25th of October 2021
(cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 25th of October 2021
(cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
25th of October 2021 (cseverin): No. Please address following points:

- 1) Please explain the reasoning for each Core Indicator identified under the "Provide additional explanation on targets..." section.
- 2) It seems highly unlikely that a global project with no national implementation will be able to deliver any stress reduction, especially not in the size of 100.000.000 ha suggested in the core indicator table.
- 3) Considering that it is not clear what impacts that marine noise may lead to it is odd that it is estimated that the impacted people will primarily be male.

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Responses, 1 June 2022

Response to (1):

? The section on ?Provide additional explanation ?? has been completed and added at the end of Table F on Core Indicators.

Response to (2):

? Some level of national-level implementation is foreseen as part of some Outputs. These include capacity building, risk and impact assessment and national baseline developments that is acknowledged that could pave the way for future seascape stress reduction; but not within the framework of this project.

? Based on the above, the claim on contribution to Core Indicator 5 was removed.

? It is worth mentioning that as a result of this ?enabling? (assessment, awareness raising, capacity building) stage of GloNoise; a follow-on project could focus much more on realizing the implementation of the toolbox of policy options created under GloNoise as well as uptake and scaling up of measures identified through the GIA, etc. to make significant contribution to realizing Core Indicator 5 in the future.

Response to (3):

? On impacts and beneficiaries, the case was fully reviewed. It is taken that the main economic impact of shipping underwater noise will be due to the loss of biodiversity and marine food resources. This could have wide implication for the whole seafood value chain; however, in this case, it is assumed that fishing industry will primarily be impacted.

? Originally, the definition of ?beneficiaries? is taken as those individuals who will take part in the project implementation and capacity building activities. This definition of ?beneficiaries? has now changed to (1) those directly engaged on the project implementation; and (2) those that will benefit from the project through reduction of shipping underwater noise (fishing sector).

? Based on the above, the number of beneficiaries for both cases estimated and included in the PIF. The description of assumptions and method of estimation is given in the ?Additional Information? under Table F of the PIF.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 25th of October 2021
(cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, [The baseline scenario is well-articulated and identifies the gaps the GEF increment will aim to fill](#)

1) [Please include reference to the previous Glo-X family of projects as associated baseline projects on which this project will build.](#)

2) [Please explain how the project intends to undertake implementation in the five pilot countries, without having LOEs that are mandatory for GEF investments if investments has any on-the-ground activities.](#)

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed. The identification of LPCs and securing respective LOEs will happen in the PPG phase. The LPC selection criteria is present in the Stakeholders section of the submission. This is in line with previously GEF-funded Glo-X projects

Agency Response

UNDP Responses, 1 June 2022

Response to (1):

? A new section was added under **Section 1.2.4** of PIF that provides an overview of the Glo-X family of projects.

Response to (2):

? As with all Glo-X family of projects that are already funded under GEF, the selection of the LPCs (Lead Pilot Countries) will take place during the PPG phase through an open system of announcement at IMO meetings and requesting for countries to participate. For transparency, this open process needs to be followed in order to demonstrate that no interested country on the subject is excluded or left behind; and also for securing wider recognition of the subject by all IMO member countries.

As with ?on the ground? activities, all LPCs will undertake baseline studies, risk assessment, capacity building and dissemination activities at the national levels. The full engagement of LPCs in the project will be facilitated using the same model of engagement employed in past Glo-X projects through global, regional and national efforts. Based on the work plan, to be developed for each country during PPG phase, countries will provide LOEs for inclusion in the ProDoc before final submission to GEF for funding.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points

1) A detailed alternative scenario advocated within the project and a sound project strategy that builds on the successful Glo-X model is presented. However, for clarity, it would be helpful to see more detail on the logic behind each project output and how each will help achieve the project outcome it is mapped to. In other words, information on what the project outputs are is quite sparse at this stage. Please elaborate accordingly.

2) Please provide a theory of change diagram

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Partly Addressed. Please include assumptions in the theory of change explanation. Please provide an elaborate theory of change and theory of change explanation during PPG. Please change the title of Component 4 in Figure 5 to avoid confusion i.e., "Project Governance". Project coordination must be mapped to PMC. If the coordination in this component is more technical in nature, the technical coordination output must better reflect this in the explanation. Please revise accordingly.

11th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Responses, 1 June 2022

Response to (1):

- ? For clarification of project outputs and how they help with achieving the relevant outcomes, the theory of change was added as a new section in the PIF (see **Section 1.3.3** of PIF).
- ? Additionally, the relationship between various project components is presented via a block diagram representing various project Components (See **Section 1.3.3** of PIF).
- ? Also as explained before, the Outputs themselves were reviewed, sharpened and made more quantifiable. **Section 1.3.4** now provides further description of outputs.

Response to (2):

- ? As per comment, the diagram for Theory of Change is now included in PIF together with a block diagram of project's Components and their relationships. (see **Section 1.3.3** of PIF)

UNDP Response 8 June 2022

Response to (2)

- ? The assumptions on theory of change were added in bullet points. These are basically justification for the theory of change.
- ? In title of Component 4, term Technical was added to remove the confusion. The explanation of Component 4 fully reflects the various outputs that include technical aspects as well as all dissemination and knowledge sharing activities.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin):

Yes

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): No, please elaborate on the incremental reasoning.

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw): No. Please move this co-financing explanation to the field under Table C. Please frame the incremental reasoning around the phrase: "In the absence of the GEF increment...." and "The GEF increment will...". Some guiding questions to evaluate the incremental cost reasoning are: what issue does the project aim to solve? What is already being done to solve the issue? What gaps/barriers have prevented past and current projects from being successful? What new work is proposed that builds off previous work to address these gaps/barriers? What will be the

environmental benefits of this new work? Some of this information is reflected elsewhere in the PIF. Please consolidate here to describe the incremental cost reasoning.

11th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 June 2022

Response to comment:

The incremental reasoning is now fully detailed in **Section 1.5** of the PIF.

UNDP Response 8 June 2022

? The explanation texts on co-financing were fully moved to field under Table C.

New texts on incremental reasoning were included as advised above.

6. Are the project?/s/program?s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points

1) Please reconsider if this MSP, with a maximum of funds for implementation under 2 mio, will be able to deliver noise reduction in the ocean to provide stress reduction in 100.000.000 ha.

2) Please remove the "1 global" under Core indicator 7.

3) Please reconsider the delivery towards core indicator 11. It seems strange that the project will be delivering benefits to 75% males, considering how many women that are involved in near coastal zone economic activities.

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw)

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Responses, 1 June 2022

Response to (1):

? On question of sea areas under Core Indicator 5, this claim has now been removed (please see response to Part I, Section 6 above on Core Indicators).

Response to (2):

? It is not clear what this comment refers to. Indicator 7 is not applicable to this project.

Response to (3):

? Information on Indicator 11 was also clarified in response to comments under Part I Section 6 on Core Indicators above and also with Additional Information in the PIF under **Section F**.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): [Please upload a global map of the LMEs and identify on this which LMEs the project will be engaging in.](#)

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 June 2022

Response to comment:

? A global map of LMEs is now included in new **Section 1.8** of the PIF.

At this stage and until the LPCs are selected, the exact LMEs of the project cannot be specified. The reason why IMO cannot specify LPCs at this stage has been fully clarified in this document as well as the PIF.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points:

1) The description seems to imply that the Lead Pilot Countries will lead the international efforts in understanding, raising awareness, defining their baseline, support policy developments. This set of activities seem to imply that there will be activities in these countries. If this is the case, LOEs needs to be submitted.

2) Please provide information on stakeholder engagement to date. How were and which stakeholders were involved in the development of this PIF? If stakeholders were not engaged, please provide justification for why. It may be useful to insert a matrix outlining the stakeholder engagement process.

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw)

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

14th of June 2022 (thenshaw). On stakeholder engagement: The project indicate that Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Civil Society organizations and Private sector Entities have been consultations during the project identification phase. It briefly highlights that at the PIF levels there has MEPC meetings but does not provide any details on the stakeholder consultation process. Please provide brief information on these stakeholder consultations in the portal submission.

15th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Response to (1): The role of LPCs has been described in the PIF as well as in response to some of the above review comments. In short, the role of LPCs under Glo-X model of projects include to:

- ? Take part in capacity building activities.
- ? Take part and support the development of baseline studies and also relevant environmental impact and risk assessments.
- ? Carry out national level dissemination activities.
- ? Support the policy development and promotion at national and international level (e.g. IMO).

? Perform the national level project's governance activities.

On the question of the LOEs and why they could not be supplied at this stage, please refer to previous responses to comments above (e.g. under Response to (2) of Section 2 above).

Response to (2):

? Stakeholders' engagement under PIF has not been extended to various countries as this would normally take place after the selection of LPCs at IMO through a transparent and open process.

? At the PIF level, the matter has been raised at IMO during the 76th meeting of the Marine Environmental Protection Committee (MEPC) in June 2021, at which the Committee (comprising of all member states and observers) asked the IMO Secretariat to discuss with potential donors, such as GEF, the potential funding of a global underwater vessel noise project (See document MEPC 76/15, paragraph 12.3.5).

UNDP Response, 15 June 2022

? Unfortunately, the check boxes were not correctly ticked in the previous version. Now it has changes.

? Accordingly, most of the detailed stakeholders' consultations including those with LPCs, industry and strategic partners will take place at the PPG phase. Reference to IMO MEPC debate on the subject was retained.

? Some of the texts moved around and enhanced to reflect the above.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following points

1) Please expand on the inclusion of both genders in the project. The section primarily identifies organizational gender policies, whereas the impact on ocean and coastal environment, its connection to economic sectoral activities and how this will impact both genders is largely missing.

2) It is noteworthy that the project proponents will only have the investment address **"improving women's participation and decision-making; "**. Please elaborate on why the project has chosen to only narrowly address one issue.

3) it is expected that the investment will be including gender responsive measures. This can NOT be TBD.

4) similarly, it is expected that the project will be addressing gender gaps in access and control over natural resources and generating socio economic benefits or services for women through the positive impact that cutting noise pollution will have.

5) it is expected that the project's results framework, will include gender sensitive indicators. TBD is not an option

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw)

(1) Not addressed. This section needs a better explanation of the gender context of the project. Please include the response in the review sheet directly in the PIF and expand on it (i.e. the value chain and future decline of marine biodiversity /impacts on gender).

(2) Can the gender scholarship (Output 2.4) be further detailed and included in this section?

(3) Addressed.

(4) The "closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources" question is not responded to. Please note yes or no.

(5) Addressed.

11th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(4) Addressed.

14th of June 2022 (thenshaw): On Gender: The project notes that "it is not the fishing capture sector that will benefit but wider industry and food chain linked to fishing capture (all downstream industries)." It also notes that "the related sea food industries downstream of fishing capture, in particular sea food processing and preparations, are generally dominated by women." The project is a great opportunity, during the projects' life cycle, to collect more data on women's roles and contributions in the different downstream sea food industries.

15th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Response to (1):

- ? GloNoise agenda and its impact on economic sector can be closely related to marine food resources and in particular fishing industry. This element is highlighted in the PIF in order to demonstrate the economic and gender aspects.
- ? While the gender aspects of fishing capture sector is heavily biased towards men (86% men versus 16% women according to FAO report) for specific reasons of working conditions, the related sea food industries downstream of fishing capture, in particular sea food processing and preparations, are generally dominated by women. For example, it is stated that "small-scale fisheries and aquaculture value chains are important for the livelihoods of coastal communities worldwide. Women play a pivotal role in small-scale fisheries around the world. Close to half of the 40 million people worldwide who work in small-scale fisheries are women. Women dominate the post-harvest handling, processing, selling of fresh fish, packaging and marketing of seafood (<https://www.iied.org/fish-night-7-gender-equality-seafood-value-chain>)".
- ? Overall it could be mentioned that the economic impacts and gender engagement varies along the value chain from fishing capture to sea food industries and both gender will be impacted **economically** due to future decline of marine biodiversity and life resources. Unfortunately, the gender aspects of the full value chain could not be evaluated. However, indicators related to fishing capture sector are included in the PIF.

Response to (2):

? The reason for choice of "improving women's participation and decision-making" is to do with the nature of GloNoise project and its objectives that is to promote decision making at international level as its main outcome. For this reason, it is appropriate for the project to fast track participation of women in such debates and decision making processes.

Response to (3):

? TBD choice was changed and gender specific elements were added and described in the PIF.

Response to (4):

? As indicated above, the issue of economic sector mostly impacted by GloNoise (i.e. marine life resources in particular fishing) now highlighted in the PIF together with reference to gender aspects.

Response to (5):

? The inclusion of gender sensitive activities is highlighted in the PIF now.

UNDP Responses 8 June 2022

Response to (1)

- ? This section was fully revised as advised by including those items from the review sheet into PIF.

Response to (2)

? The explanation of the gender scholarship enhanced. It is included under last bullet of the relevant section with more details

Response to (4)

There was no Yes/No option. However, it is ticked now.

UNDP Response, 15 June 2022

? The sentence ?It is important to emphasize that it is not the fishing capture sector that will benefit but wider industry and food chain linked to fishing capture (all downstream industries? was not meant what it says.

? The sentence now changed to ?It is important to emphasize that the fishing capture sector is not the only one that will benefit but also wider industry and food chain linked to fishing capture (all downstream industries)?.

The comment on collection of more data on gender aspects was taken onboard and the following sentence added to commit GloNoise to do some studies: ?On the gender issue, and as part of the gender related Output, the project will aim to collect more data on women's roles and contributions in the different downstream sea food industries to further understand the impact of underwater noise on global gender equality aspects.?

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, Please address following issues:

- 1) the rationale for private sector engagement in the project should be better articulated in this section.
- 2) Please outline here what the role of the private sector will be in the GIA and GSP and how the private sector will be onboarded.
- 3) Please also expand on the differences between the GIA and GSP.

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw)

- (1) Addressed.
- (2) Addressed.
- (3) Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Responses, 1 June 2022

Response to (1):

? The rationale and additional details were added to section on ?Private Sector Engagement?. Also, the section on ?Stakeholders? was enhanced with further description of the planned GIA (Global Industry Alliance) agenda.

Response to (2):

- ? The private sector will mainly engage in GIA and not the GSP. The main role of private sector is to articulate the private sectors approach to the mitigation of underwater noise from international shipping (Component 3 activities), and to help with the development of global toolkits and risk assessment methodologies as well as capacity building training material (Component 1).
- ? The role of GSP that would comprise countries and institutions, primarily from developed countries with significant knowhow on underwater noise as well significant interest on underwater noise reduction, is to help with promotion of policy options and supporting the LPCs via development of bilateral relationships.
- ? All the above details are now further clarified in the PIF.

Response to (3):

- ? GIA is mainly private sector and in particular the industry that will form collectively a GloNoise GIA and will pay cash membership to ?GIA Fund? and will provide additional in-kind resources to develop and implement the GIA work plan. As indicated, this model has tried and tested successfully under other Glo-X projects.
- ? GSP on the other hand comprises all countries/organizations that agree to support GloNoise in-kind rather than payment of membership fee. The GSPs generally will be linked to governments and thus are expected to be public organizations or from ministries of those countries who agree to join in. GSPs are expected to comprise those developed countries that highly advocate the need for mitigation of underwater noise from shipping.
- ? To further differentiate between GIA and GSP, typical organizations or governments to be invited to each are now listed in the PIF.
- ? All of the above was further clarified in the PIF.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, please address following issues:

1) Please include a matrix that focuses on the specific risks associated with Covid-19, including a more thorough analysis of the potential impacts (including both opportunities and constraints) of the pandemic to the project (both short term and long term).

2) Please also describe the risks of the pandemic to project sustainability and how these will be overcome.

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw)

(1) Partly addressed. A full Covid-19 screen must also include an opportunity analysis. Please provide one-to-two paragraphs on the opportunities for the project emerging from the pandemic. How can the project help to "build back better" etc...

(2) Addressed.

11th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Responses, 1 June 2022

Response to (1): On risks and impacts of COVID

? The relevant risks are added to the risk table.

? Generally and in view of current status of COVID internationally, the risk of COVID in achieving project outputs is assessed as low. For details, please see Risk Table in **Section 5** of the PIF.

Response to (2):

The relevant risks were added to the Risk Table in **Section 5** of PIF.

UNDP Response 8 June 2022

Response to (1)

? Under risk 5, a whole paragraph was added. The case was not fully clear but I hope the text is to the point.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Partly, [please better describe the monitoring and evaluation arrangements and provide a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other initiatives.](#)

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Partly Addressed. Are there other GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives that the project will coordinate with? If so, please identify them and note what the benefits of coordination will be.

11th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 June 2022

Response to comment:

Further description of monitoring and evaluation was added (please see last paragraph of **Section 6** of PIF).

UNDP Response 8 June 2022

? The text further improved by adding some projects. However, the exact detail of projects to be coordinated with, will be identified during PPG.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Please expand this section.

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Please note this explanation in the review sheet directly in the PIF in the Consistency with National Priorities section so the reader understands that this section will be fully developed once LPCs are identified in PPG.

11th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 June 2022

Response to comments:

? As indicated, the LPCs will be identified under the PPG phase using the same format and process that has successfully done under past IMO-GEF-UNDP Glo-X projects. This topic will be dealt with then.

? However, the PIF already mentions this issue and emphasizes that the choice of LPCs will also be guided by their previous engagement on the subject and if they already have any policy, strategy, etc. in this area. Please see **Section 2** of the PIF where the main features of the LPCs are described.

As for alignment with national strategies, policies and plans, please note that national level baselines to be established under Component 1 of the project will address the current status of the country, inclusive of existing policies and strategies, that will subsequently lead to future policy options at national and international levels.

UNDP Response 8 June 2022

? This is already included in PIF and the text further enhanced.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): Yes. The risk classification is set as ?Low?. A pre-SESP for the project is attached.

Agency Response

Part III ? Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country?s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): not applicable as tagged as global project. But may be needed if the project has identified five pilot lead countries in which national activities will take place.

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed. LPCs will be identified during PPG using selection criteria and an LOE for each LPC will be secured before CEO Endorsement Request submission.

14th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Letters of Endorsement (LoEs): in Table B there are outcomes (outcome 2) and outputs (outputs 1.2; 2.2; 2.4) that will take place in countries. While it is understood from comments in the review sheet that participant countries have not been identified at PIF stage, LoEs of participant countries will be required at CEO Approval stage.

Agency Response

UNDP Response, 1 June 2022

NOTE ? The Letters of Endorsement (LoEs) of Lead Pilot Countries to this project will be secured during the PPG phase as per the same process as with other GEF-UNDP-IMO Glo-X projects. The logic behind this approach was that by being a global project, selection of geographically distributed, yet committed pilot countries will serve as the best model and this would require extensive consultation with the pilot countries on not only their selection but also for specific agreement with each on their project-related action plan.

As such, at PPG phase, wide consultations for selection of the LPCs will be carried out and subsequent to selection; concrete action / work plan for each LPC is agreed. Letter of Endorsement and Commitment will then be obtained from the LPCs and supplied with the full-size Project Document. This process has been followed with all other past and currently active GEF-funded Glo-X projects. There is ample evidence for wide support from IMO member States for global projects and no issue is foreseen to secure the participation of relevant selected countries. The process described above simply leads to the choice of the most appropriate LPCs for the project via extensive consultation on well-defined action plans. The process also follows the IMO open and transparent system and all-inclusive information provision to all member states for selection of LPCs on a consensus basis to ensure future sustainability of such global activities.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA
Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25th of October 2021 (cseverin): No, please address the above comments

4th of June 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

14th of June 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

15th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Yes

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval