



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Transforming the Global Maritime Transport Industry towards a Low Carbon Future through Improved Energy Efficiency (GloMEEP)			
Country(ies):	Global	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	5508
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	5201
Other Executing Partner(s):	International Maritime Organisation	Submission Date:	3 Dec. 2014
		Resubmission date:	23 Feb. 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multifocal Area	Project Duration(Months)	24
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	\$180,500
➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/>			
➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>			
➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>			

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CCM-1 (select)	Outcome 1.2: Enabling policy environment and mechanisms created for technology transfer	Output 1.2: National strategies for the deployment and commercialization of innovative low-carbon technologies adopted	GEF TF	300,000	2,000,000
CCM-4 (select)	Outcome 4.1: Sustainable transport and urban policy and regulatory frameworks adopted and implemented	Output 4.3: Energy savings achieved	GEF TF	700,000	6,000,000
IW-2 (select)	Outcome 2.3: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, rebuilding or protecting fish stocks with rights-based management, ICM, habitat (blue forest) restoration/conservation, and port management and produce measurable results	Output 2.2: National and local policy /legal / institutional reforms adopted/ implemented  Output 2.4: Enhanced capacity for issues of climatic variability and change	GEF TF	900,000	3,875,600
<b>Total project costs</b>				1,900,000	11,875,600

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective:** To build capacity in developing countries for implementing the technical and operational measures for energy efficient shipping and to catalyze overall reductions in GHG emissions from global shipping

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Legal, policy and institutional reforms for GHG reductions through improved energy efficiency within maritime transport sector in developing countries (CC and IW)	TA	1.1 Pilot countries undertaking legal, policy and institutional reforms (LPIR) to implement Maritime Energy Efficiency Framework (MEEF) and acting as catalysts for increased uptake of MEEF by other developing countries at a global scale	<p>1.1.1 Global tools and guidance for LPIR developed including model legislations, guidance on compliance monitoring and enforcement methodologies and best practices; and guidance on Energy Efficiency Operational Indicator (EEOI) calculation and analysis tools.</p> <p>1.1.2 10 pilot countries established National Task Forces (inter-ministerial and cross-sectoral) and drafted national legislation in line with the international regulations on GHG emissions from ships;</p> <p>1.1.3 Pilot countries integrated MEEF into port and infrastructure planning for future growth;</p> <p>1.1.4 Global Tools (output 1.1.1) and pilot country experiences will be shared and disseminated at global level, thus laying the foundation for global actions on ships' energy efficiency, bringing maximum of systemic impacts at global level by taking advantage of the unique opportunity that shipping is mostly</p>	GEF TF	770,000	6,810,500

			international			
2. Maritime sector energy efficiency capacity-building, awareness raising, knowledge creation and dissemination (CC and IW)	TA	2.1 Enhanced awareness and capacity to implement ship energy efficiency measures (operational, design) in the pilot countries	<p>2.1.1 Developed capacity-building tools and training courses on ship EEDI and SEEMP;</p> <p>2.1.2 Created global knowledge sharing forums on energy efficiency within maritime sector including port infrastructure and logistics facilities;</p> <p>2.1.3 Developed a pool of global trainers who have successfully completed trainer certification through “train-the-trainer” workshops;</p> <p>2.1.4 Developed procedures for estimating the financial / economic benefits of energy efficiency measures in the maritime transport industry and port facilities; 10 pilot countries and at least one major port in each pilot country undertaking financial/economic assessments of implementing MEEF framework;</p> <p>2.1.5 Conducted training workshops at national levels and integrated into national maritime academic and practical training curriculum</p>	GEF TF	700,000	2,255,000
3. Public-private partnerships to catalyse innovation and R&D and	TA	3.1 Accelerated development of Maritime Energy Efficiency related	3.1.1 Establishment of Global Industry Alliance (GIA) for MEEF as a private-	GEF TF	210,000	1,677,600

technology transfer to meet the needs of developing countries (CC and IW)		innovations suited for developing countries and accelerated diffusion of these innovations among the maritime transport sector in the 10 pilot countries through catalyzing technology transfer and collaborative efforts between government, maritime industry and technology developers;	sector collaboration platform;  3.1.2 Under the auspices of GIA, catalyze the development and maintenance of a global database on energy efficient ship technologies and port facilities  3.1.3 Facilitate forums for private sector and technology developers for demonstrating application of EE measures and dissemination of particularly notable improvements in maritime transport efficiency technology and practices.			
4. Monitoring. Learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation	TA	4.1 Monitoring. Learning, adaptive feedback and evaluation	4.1.1 Adaptive project management and coordination for implementation, monitoring and evaluation	GEF TF	60,000	284,500
Subtotal					1,740,000	11,027,600
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup>				(select)	160,000	848,000
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>1,900,000</b>	<b>11,875,600</b>

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Argentina, China, Georgia, India, Jamaica, Malaysia, Morocco, Panama, Phillipines, South Africa	In-kind	2,947,600
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	IMO	In-kind	6,794,000
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	IMO	Cash	624,000
Others	Global Strategic Partners (Singapore MPA)	In-kind	1,260,000
Private Sector	Maritime Industry	Cash	70,000
Private Sector	Maritime Industry	In-kind	105,000

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

GEF Agency	UNDP	In-kind	75,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			11,875,600

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Climate Change	Global	1,000,000	95,000	1,095,000
UNDP	GEF TF	International Waters	Global	900,000	85,500	985,500
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				1,900,000	180,500	2,080,500

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	984,000	922,000	1,906,000
National/Local Consultants	362,000	528,800	890,800

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>**

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.NA

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. NA

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: NA

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: NA

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The methodology to estimate the GHG reductions to be catalyzed by the project has been adjusted/improved since PIF approval, the new methodology is described in prodoc section 1.4.2 and is derived from three simple

<sup>4</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

assumptions/inputs: 1. Nearly full uptake and ultimate implementation of IMO MEEF by the 10 LPCs (but modest ‘leakage’ of MEEF success to other developing countries), 2. LPCs represent 33% of global ship tonnage, and 3. MEPC 63/INF.2 Assessment report on CO<sub>2</sub> reduction potential due to IMO Energy Efficiency Regulations”, October 2011. In short, the project is projected to catalyse 38, 56 and 71 million mt/year net reduction in GHG emissions from the shipping sector by 2020, 2030 and 2050, respectively, all derived from effective IMO MEEF implementation in the 10 target Lead Partner Countries (LPCs). Assuming a linear rate of progress on these CO<sub>2</sub> reduction rates across these three base years, this translates into 95 million tonnes avoided CO<sub>2</sub>eq through 2020, 565 million tonnes avoided CO<sub>2</sub>eq through 2030, and 1,835 million tonnes avoided CO<sub>2</sub> eq through 2050 (see Climate Change Tracking Tool).

A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: NA

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives: GloMEEP GEF ‘sister’ projects, the GEF-UNDP-ICAO Transforming Global Aviation Sector/Emissions Reductions, and the EBRD Green Logistics Mediterranean/Black Sea, will both be invited to attend GPTF meetings to facilitate coordination between these closely related initiatives which share objectives of industry transformation in the context of climate change.

## **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

In this project, a significant number of LPCs (Lead Pilot Countries) and other maritime stakeholders exist at global, regional and national levels. To ensure full engagement of stakeholders, provisions are made within project strategy and M&E for various stakeholders to get involved in project implementation, steering and monitoring activities. The following will ensure the full stakeholders engagement:

- Stakeholders’ consultation meetings: These meetings have already been conducted at PPG stage and have been quite successful in ensuring the buy-in by national stakeholders early in the project concept. This will ensure not only smoother inception phase of the project but more effective and harmonised future implementation by stakeholders.
- Project M&E structure and reports: M&E structure in particular the setting up of the task forces (e.g. Global Project Task Force (GPTF) and National Task Force (NTF)) would ensure wider participation and contribution by stakeholders in steering as well as review of project deliverables. Additionally, provisions for organising ad hoc National Stakeholder Workshops are foreseen; not only to disseminate the information but also to receive feedback on the project activities.
- Setting up of the GloMEEP GIA: This will be formed via participation of major industry partners and will promote wider stakeholders engagement via providing resources to the project and actively taking part in industrial oriented activities such as technology assessment and deployment within the GIA framework.

During the implementation of the project, guidance will be provided on the stakeholders’ involvement method and the roles, responsibilities and relationships among the stakeholders; and mechanisms for their optimal involvement in the project activities. Clear roles and responsibilities can ensure ownership and facilitate smooth implementation. This together with stakeholders’ benefiting throughout for the project from studies, workshops, training, reviews and legal and institutional analysis will ensure continuation of their engagement.

Additionally, IMO, through organisation of Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) and its relevant working groups will facilitate wider international debates and stakeholders engagements.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF): GloMEEP will enhance global capacity in, and accelerate uptake of, technical and operational measures for far more energy-efficient shipping, leading to reduced GHG emissions as well as reduced ocean acidification (and associated reductions in stress on all of the world’s 64 Large Marine Ecosystems and high seas), reduced particulate matter, sulphur and nitrogen oxide emissions and the related benefits of improved coastal and port air quality. The project also delivers economic benefits and

commercial advantage at the ship, port, and sector-operation levels via reducing costs and sustainable benefits into the future.

The economic benefits of the project is multi-faceted including savings in shipping fuel costs, enhanced technologies and creation of green jobs, and much elevated energy conservation culture in shipping. Moreover, shipping emissions reductions will have local health benefits (and associated reduced health care costs) world-wide on ports, coastal urban areas, and marine ecosystems, relating to reductions in particulate matter, sulphur and nitrogen emissions and improved air quality. In terms of development benefits, the project will also help provide a level playing field to developing countries for advancement in efficient and profitable sea trade and facilitate south-south cooperation.

Regarding gender equality and engagement, the project intends to make sure, at implementation level, that the issue of balanced gender participation in various activities and in particular in capacity building activities is taken into account and ensuring that gender equality issues are considered as part of participation in project activities.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design: The global and national approach taken to address the GHG emissions reduction from international shipping promoted by this project will be conducive to cost-effectiveness as it will promote sharing of experiences between a number of leading maritime developing nations (strong South-South Partnership) and the formation of the GIA and involvement of the private sector in these efforts (strong North-South Partnership). The project will address the core issue of taking advantage of the IMO MEEF as a driver to catalyse a more energy efficient shipping in the developing countries. On a cost per GHG reduction basis, the total project budget of \$13.775 m. would deliver cost effectiveness of \$0.36 per mt CO<sub>2</sub>e by 2020, \$0.25 per mt CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr by 2030 and \$0.19 per met CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr. by 2050.

The global guidance documents, methodologies and templates to be developed within the project and then rolled out and used for country assessments, LPIR and capacity building will provide a very cost effective methodology for driving the GloMEEP agenda in 10 countries; and this in turn will lead to each LPC to learn from the partnership and reduce development cost of strengthening the governance aspect of national shipping energy management regulation and best practice.

The project will also help to reduce the costs of mitigating the impacts of shipping sector on climate change via i) helping to ensure that mitigation aspects are addressing the issues at source and ii) maximising the involvement in, and commitment to, sustainable and economically viable management of GHG emissions from ships.

Cost-effectiveness will be further promoted by working with, and through, existing national institutions that already have some organisational capacities, thereby limiting the level of investment that the project will need to make in creating such capacities. The use of technical resources already developed as part of the IMO KOICA project and IMO's Technical Cooperation Programme also is another aspects of project cost-effectiveness.

In summary, the project cost-effectiveness aspects are enhanced via:

- Leveraging the huge IMO regulatory development with its significant costs.
- Use of existing global and national mechanisms such as those governing IMO, UNDP, GEF and National Administrations.
- The pyramid-modelled implementation aspects of the GloMEEP; that any global developments (guidance documents, methodologies, legislative text, workshop material, etc.) will be implemented at wider level not only within 10 LPCs but also in wider maritime community through effective dissemination?

**C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:** Please refer to Section 5 of ProDoc entitled Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (Page 111-114 of ProDoc) which shows in detail the reporting and budgeted monitoring and evaluation activities.


**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
NA	NA	NA	

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator, UNDP/GEF		23 Feb. 2015	Andrew Hudson	1 212 906 6228	andrew.hudson@undp.org



**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).  
Please refer to Section 3.2, page 93-101 of the Project Document entitled "Project Results Framework")

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Responses to Comments at PIF Approval Stage

Comment	Response	ProDoc section for details
<p>Estimated GHG emissions reduction brought by the project</p>	<p>The proposed project will act as a seed and catalyst that will lead to much more successful implementation of the IMO MEEF across developing countries with associated reductions in shipping sector's GHG emissions, global climate change and ocean acidification.</p> <p>As described in detail in prodoc section 1.4.2, based on the following data and assumptions: 1. Nearly full uptake and ultimate implementation of IMO MEEF by the 10 LPCs (but modest 'leakage' of MEEF success to other developing countries), 2. LPCs represent 33% of global ship tonnage, and 3. MEPC 63/INF.2 Assessment report on CO<sub>2</sub> reduction potential due to IMO Energy Efficiency Regulations", October 2011, the near, medium and long-term projected shipping sector CO<sub>2</sub> reductions catalysed by the GEF project are estimated at 38, 56 and 71 million tonnes/year by 2020, 2030 and 2050, respectively. Assuming a linear rate of progress on these CO<sub>2</sub> reduction rates across these three base years, this translates into 95 million tonnes avoided CO<sub>2</sub>eq through 2020, 565 million tonnes avoided CO<sub>2</sub>eq through 2030, and 1,835 million tonnes avoided CO<sub>2</sub> eq through 2050 (see Climate Change Tracking Tool).</p>	<p>See Sections 1.4.2, Page 27-28 of ProDoc for detailed calculations on estimated global GHG reductions in the alternative scenario.</p> <p>Climate Change Mitigation Tracking Tool</p>
<p>Establishment of cooperative relationship between IMO and GEF Operational Focal Points in the pilot countries</p>	<p>As part of PPG phase of the project, efforts were made to invite the LPCs' GEF Operational Focal Points (GAFP) to national consultation meetings. This took place in a number of countries (e.g. China, Philippines, Malaysia). In these cases, the link between relevant country maritime administration and GAFP are already established.</p> <p>During implementation phase and as part of stakeholders' engagement, every effort will be made to include the GEF OFP in the National Task Force of the project to ensure that the already established links between Maritime Administrations (as Countries' Lead Agencies for GloMEEP)</p>	

	and GOFP are maintained and the GloMEEP efforts proceed in-line with other GEF relevant national efforts.	
Coordination with EBRD initiative in Russian Federation: Contact EBRD to bring synergy for the two projects.	The contact with EBRD was established and the feedback received was that the EBRD initiative in Russian Federation has not taken off and currently is on hold due to recent political events in the region.	Not Applicable
Project meetings with key agencies (GEF/UNDP and IMO)	Within GloMEEP project, an Executive Committee (Ex-Comm) is foreseen for top level project coordination. The Ex-Comm will comprise representatives from GEF/UNDP (implementation agency) and IMO (executive agency). In the project M&E plan, two meetings are foreseen for Ex-Comm for monitoring purposes. These meetings are most likely to take place back to back with Global Project Task Force (GPTF) meetings to enable the participation of ExComm members with wider LPCs focal points and GIA Industrial Partners.	See Outcome 4 on Page 65-68 of ProDoc for relevant Ex-Comm activities

Responses to Comments at CEO Endorsement Stage

Comment	Response	ProDoc section for details
Please provide strengthened description on how the national demos will inform the regional and global policy processes.	Please note that there are No National Demonstration Projects and that these were not part of the approved PIF. However, GloMEEP project's national and regional activities, in particular in area of LPIR (Legal, Policy and Institutional Reforms), involves assessment of LPCs' maritime energy efficiency status as well as development of their NMEES (National Maritime Energy Efficiency Strategies) under Component 1 of the project. These developments at national level will then be disseminated within various capacity building and knowledge sharing activities under Component 2 at national and regional levels. Additionally, the results of the project will be widely disseminated globally via use of the IMO Secretariat office and relevant MEPC meetings where normally more than 600 participants from almost all member countries,	Not Applicable

	industry associations and NGOs take part. In this way, the project will inform and influence the global policy processes that are developed by IMO and are extensively applicable to international shipping.	
Awareness. The concept of awareness needs to be better defined or potentially quantified. For example, the baseline scenario describes there is "general awareness" of the MEEF. The analysis on why the MEEF will only be partially achieved without GEF intervention, however, list "lack of awareness" as a key reason (para 3, page 25). In the outcome session, "enhanced awareness" is a key deliverable. Please briefly explain what awareness means in these three contexts.	The "general awareness" mentioned here is mainly awareness on existence of MEEF and relevant regulatory requirements, mainly by maritime administration and shipping industry, rather than deep understanding of the implementation, enforcement and best practice issues. This in depth awareness which is required for an accelerated uptake and implementation of MEEF is lacking in developing countries. This "enhanced awareness" is therefore included as one of the expected outcomes of the Project.	Relevant changes and footnotes were added to ProDoc (Page 25) to clarify the case.
a) At the PIF stage, GEF proposed to add "a global database on energy efficient ship technologies and port facilities as one of the outputs" and this output doesn't seem to be added to the latest document. Please explain.  b) Output 1.3: Integrating MEEF into port and infrastructure planning in developing countries is a great idea. Please briefly list the criteria for selecting pilot countries.	a) Please note that this important output was already included under output 3.2 in page 62 of the ProDoc. This was also already included in Table B under output 3.1.2 (GEF CEO Endorsement Request Document)  b) Selection of the pilot countries among the LPCs for this port activities was based on the LPC consultation during the PPG phase and included the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LPCs with important and strong maritime policies on port development and port business (e.g. Jamaica and Morocco) are given priority.</li> <li>• LPCs where there is strong link between Maritime Administrations and Port Authorities are given priority. In some LPCs, and due to the way shipping and ports are managed, there is a disconnect</li> </ul>	See output 3.2 in page 62 of the ProDoc and Table B under output 3.1.2 of GEF CEO Endorsement Request Document  Criteria added in Page 49 of ProDoc

	<p>between port authorities and maritime administrations governance, thus these countries could not commit carrying our significant activities in this area due to governance issues (e.g China and India).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LPCs where there are already port-related activities and they expressed to extend these to energy efficiency activities (e.g. Malaysia).</li> <li>• Resource constraints of the project that did not allow for a large number of port-related investigations in all; thus generally limited activities to one country in each region.</li> <li>• For port-related energy efficiency capacity building, the above criteria were relaxed so that more countries could take part in such activities.</li> </ul>	
<p>please elaborate on the socio economics and the gender dimension of this investment.</p>	<p>Added a new section “socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions” in ProDoc, Page 74.</p> <p>Added a new paragraph on “gender dimension” in CEO endorsement request Page 7)</p>	<p>ProDoc, Page 74</p> <p>CEO endorsement request Page 7</p>
<p>please elaborate on the public participation, including CSO</p>	<p>NGOs = CSOs are foreseen to be part of various stakeholder groups and the National Task Forces in the countries as well as part of global steering group, to give each a role in project oversight and governance. However, no specific tasks have been allocated to NGOs to implement. Some industry NGOs such as the class societies have become partner to the project through private sector partnerships and may be involved in delivering certain activities should there be expertise in-house.</p> <p>Opportunities for direct involvement of CSOs in delivering GloMEEP activities is limited considering the</p>	<p>A footnote on NGOs is added on page 35 of ProDoc.</p>

	<p>nature of the project that deals primarily with the global shipping industry and national maritime administrations.</p>	
<p>Please consider the coordination with GEF project of improving energy efficiency in the aviation sector. In addition, EBRD is developing a green logistics project with GEF in the Mediterranean and Black Sea regions. There is great synergy between these two projects.</p>	<p>Very welcome comments; both projects have very similar objectives, to strengthen the enabling policy environment to significantly reduce the climate footprint of two major global transport industries, shipping and aviation. To address, both the ICAO and EBRD projects will be invited to Global Project Task Force meetings as well as other information and experience sharing through virtual means.</p>	<p>Please see ProDoc p. 66 to reflect this</p>
<p>please strengthen the coordination with relevant GEF Investments, especially the IW LME portfolio seems to be of utmost importance here, as well as portfolio KM projects such as LME learn and IW:LEARN.</p>	<p>It may be noted that, in the time frame of this project, even if there is big success and strong industry take-up of MEEF, the impacts on the oceans and LMEs won't be felt/noticeable for some years as the shipping actions slowly but surely begin to reduce the industry's carbon footprint. So the suggestion would be that we primarily focus on having the project represented at IWCs, to make sure the LME constituencies know that there is a key ocean industry, shipping, on 'their side' regarding this long-term but quite substantial threat of Ocean Acidification to LME health and functioning and the steps the shipping industry in particular is taking to reduce its share of the problem. This may in turn assist LME projects to include shipping GHG emissions and ocean acidification among possible priority issues during LME TDA/SAP formulation processes, which should assist the overall efforts and impact of GloMEEP by expanding the reach of project impact to even more countries.</p>	<p>Section 5.3, page 114 of ProDoc.</p>

	The project is already committed to full participation in GEF IW-LEARN: as stated in section 5.3, page 114 of ProDoc.	
Please briefly describe the innovative nature of the project.	Section on “innovative aspects and potential for scaling up” has been added in ProDoc	Please see ProDoc page 81
None of the country support letters specified the amount of in-kind. Please explain how \$2,947,600 was acquired?	The financial tables have been sent as attachment to the commitment letter by each country (signed by heads of maritime administrations) and numbers are taken from the financial tables each of which provides detail on all contributor’s cash and in-kind contributions to the project. These detailed tables are in ProDoc Annexes 1-5. LPC Co-financing tables are given in Annex 3 (ProDoc Section 7.3, page 146-229)	ProDoc Section 7.3, page 146-229  Also, a footnote has been added in the ProDoc to reflect this. (ProDoc page 76).
The cash amount committed by the Maritime industry didn’t add up to \$175,000. Please explain.	In part C of GEF Endorsement, a correction was made by adding a new row to clarify this: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private sector Cash as 70,000 (amended from 175,000)</li> <li>• Private sector In-kind as 105,000 (added)</li> </ul> Please also note that as GIA grows once it is commissioned during the project, it is expected that more and more private sector companies will contribute cash contribution; these and other additionally mobilized co-finance will be reported via annual GEF PIR process.	Please see end of Page 4 Table of “GEF CEO Endorsement Request”.

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>5</sup>**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Country consultations	83,160	39,937	43,223
Preparation of Project Document	16,840	0	16,840
Please note that figures provided in this table reflect those up to 30 September 2014 and are based on non-audited expenditure report. The final expenditure report will be ready by May 2015.			
<b>Total</b>	100,000	39,937	60,063

<sup>5</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.



**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A