



**GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND**

GEF ID:	9605		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Building Partnerships to Assist Developing Countries Minimize the Impacts from Aquatic Biofouling (GloFouling Partnerships)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5775 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1 Program 1; IW-3 Program 6;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$6,980,000
Co-financing:	\$33,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$40,280,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Andrew Hudson

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	5th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes, the project is fully aligned with the GEF IW FA strategy and results framework. Further, the proposed project will also deliver substantially towards the CC Corporate GEB. As there is no opportunity for noting down the tremendous contribution for the participating countries to the Aichi targets, please make sure to	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>make specific note of this. This is already done in section 1.3.2, but also in section 1.3.1, para 9, (pp 18) seems to offer a great opportunity for highlighting the contributions to the CBD, in line with what is already included for the UNFCCC.</p> <p>Please investigate if the project will be delivering against Corporate target 6 (enhancing capacity of countries to implement MEAs and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks)</p> <p>29th of august 2016(cseverin):Addressed</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>5th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project appears to be fully aligned with the global agenda on Haul Fouling, however, please include a letter from IMO (and if possible other organizations mentioned in the section), supporting the statements outlined in section 1.2.1. As a Global project it is good if proof can be provided of the novelty and the global importance this project can be provided in the form of "endorsements/support letters" from other entities than the implementing.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		29th of august 2016(cseverin):Addressed	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	5th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes, descriptions has been included to both the potential carbon savings, as well as the positive impact on IAS the proposed project and its activities will have.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	5th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes, detailed incremental reasoning has been provided.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	5th of August 2016 (cseverin):Partly. The activities suggested in the components will be delivering towards the formulated objective. However, please indicate level of impact: 1ii: How many countries will biofouling management policies be incorporated into existing sector policies and strategies. This is a persistent issue throughout the results framework, namely that the project mention to be delivering substantial and essential outputs, along the lines of incorporating biofouling in to national policies, but does not mention in how many countries. At the stage of PIF it will	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>be fine if just a ball park figure will be included, to understand the impact of the proposed activities.</p> <p>Under component 2, on top of the above mentioned issue, please also include an estimated number of mass media campaigns, documentaries, etc.</p> <p>What measures are in place within the cooperating organizations to ensure that the proposed investment will be successful in its aim to catalyze global transformation in reducing the unwanted transfer of IAS via biofouling, and potentially as successful as the GLOBALLAST process was/is.</p> <p>Is a convention on Biofouling planned or one of the potential measures that is considered to address the issue in a coherent way globally???</p> <p>29th of august 2016(cseverin):Addressed</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	5th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes, adequately described at the time of PIF submission.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	5th of August 2016 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed grant is available under the IW focal area.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	8th of August 2016 (cseverin): No, the CC funding is not available for this proposed investment, please adjust budget. 29th of august 2016(cseverin): Adjusted	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	5th of August 2016 (cseverin): No please address above comments and resubmit. 29th of august 2016(cseverin): Yes, the project is recommended for technical clearance	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.