
Adaptation Fund Board
Forty-fifth meeting
Bonn, Germany
9–10 October 2025

REPORT OF THE FORTY-FIFTH MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

Introduction

1. The forty-fifth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) was held in person in Bonn, Germany, on 9 and 10 October 2025, back-to-back with the thirty-sixth meetings of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) and Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) of the Board on 7 and 8 October 2025. The meeting was preceded by an informal session, held on 6 October and continued on the afternoon of 8 October, to discuss the implications of decision 1/CMA.6, on the new collective quantified goal on climate finance.
2. The list of the members and alternate members who participated in the meeting is attached as annex I. A list of accredited observers present at the meeting can be found in document AFB/B.45/Inf.2.

Item 1. Opening of the meeting

3. As the Chair of the Board was unable to attend the meeting, the meeting was opened at 9.15 a.m. on 9 October 2025 by the Vice-Chair, Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe, Africa), in accordance with paragraph 11 of the Rules of procedure of the Adaptation Fund Board.

Item 2. Adoption of the agenda

4. The Board adopted the agenda for its forty-fifth meeting on the basis of the provisional agenda (AFB/B.45/1). The agenda is set out in annex II to the present report.
5. In adopting the agenda, the Board agreed to consider two matters under agenda item 20, “Other matters”:
 - (a) Application of the “roll over” principle for terms of members and alternates;
 - (b) Constitution of task forces and working groups.
6. The following members and alternate members declared conflicts of interest:
 - Naima Oumoussa (Morocco, Africa)
 - Washington Zhakata (Zimbabwe, Africa)

- John Payai Manyok (South Sudan, Africa)
- Aram Ter- Zakaryan (Armenia, Eastern Europe)
- Kenrick Williams (Belize, Latin America and the Caribbean)
- Victor Viñas (Dominican Republic, Latin America and the Caribbean)
- Bertha I. Argueta Tejeda (Honduras, Latin America and the Caribbean)
- Rosa Morales Saravia (Peru, Latin America and the Caribbean)
- Diann C. Black-Layne (Antigua and Barbuda, Small Island Developing States)
- Mani Mate (Cook Islands, Small Island Developing States)
- Naresh Sharma (Nepal, Least Developed Countries)
- Lucas Di Pietro (Argentina, Non-Annex I Parties)
- Choikhand Janchivlamdan (Mongolia, Non-Annex I Parties)
- Maria Luwalhati Dorotan Tiuseco (Philippines, Non-Annex I Parties)

Item 3. Report on the activities of the Chair

7. Given the absence of the Chair, the Vice-Chair proposed that the Board take note of the Chair's report on the activities undertaken on the Board's behalf during the intersessional period between the Board's forty-fourth and forty-fifth meetings (AFB/B.45/2).
8. The Board took note of the information provided in the report.

Item 4. Report on activities of the secretariat

9. The Manager of the secretariat reported on the activities of the secretariat (AFB/B.45/3).
10. Following his presentation, several members raised concerns regarding the late issuance of documents, saying that it significantly hindered their preparation for the meeting and affected the Board's ability to make informed decisions in a timely, constructive and responsible manner. One member suggested that the secretariat issue the documents by the agreed deadline and then issue revised versions as needed. He also noted that the reports of the Chair and the secretariat could be issued later to ensure that they included all the activities carried out during the intersessional period.
11. Responding to members' concerns, the Manager of the secretariat assured the Board that the situation would be rectified and that documents would be issued in a timely manner in future.
12. One member requested a number of changes to the wording of the report, including the removal of the reference to a submission made to the Global Solidarity Levies Task Force, on the grounds that the secretariat had not been given a mandate to make such a submission and the Global Solidarity Levies Task Force did not hold consensus multilateral endorsement as a mechanism contributing to the Fund, which was required. He also asked that the wording used to refer to a gender knowledge study be brought into line with the Board-endorsed

wording used in the report of the Board to the Conference of the Parties serving as meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) and the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA); other members, however, noting that the reference was to a knowledge product of the Adaptation Fund, said that they did not see the need for such alignment.

13. The Manager of the Secretariat clarified that the submission to the Global Solidarity Levies Task Force had been made as part of a mandate related to the existing resource mobilization strategy and entailed no commitment on behalf of the Fund, but assured the Board that the secretariat would follow the Board's guidance regarding the appropriateness of such initiatives.

14. The Board took note of the information provided, on the understanding that a revised version of the document would be issued with the requested amendments. The revised report was subsequently issued as document AFB/B.45/3/Rev.1.

Item 5. Dialogue with civil society organizations

15. The dialogue with civil society organizations consisted of presentations in accordance with the agenda for the dialogue (AFB/B.45/4), followed by a short question period. The report on the dialogue is set out in annex III to the present report.

16. The Board took note of the presentations and recommendations of the civil society organizations.

Item 6. Status of the transition of the Adaptation Fund to serve the Paris Agreement

17. A representative of the secretariat presented the status of the transition of the Adaptation Fund to serve the Paris Agreement (AFB/B.45/5).

18. The Board continued its discussion in a closed session, following which it adopted the decision below.

19. The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), having considered document AFB/B.45/5 and its addenda, which included draft new Terms and Conditions of Services to be Provided by the World Bank as Trustee, the trustee's discussion note and a draft memorandum of understanding with the Global Environment Facility Council for secretariat services to the Board, decided:

(a) To express its appreciation for the efforts of the World Bank in drafting new terms and conditions of services to be provided by the World Bank as trustee of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund ("Terms and Conditions") prepared for the forty-fifth meeting of the Board (AFB/B.45/5/Add.2);

(b) To reaffirm decision 1/CMP.14, which states that the Adaptation Fund shall continue to receive a share of proceeds, if available, from activities under articles 6, 12 and 17 of the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change;

(c) To take note of the progress made during the forty-fifth meeting of the Board concerning the draft memorandum of understanding (MOU) regarding secretariat services to the Board;

(d) To express its intention to further revise and finalize the draft Terms and Conditions and the draft MOU regarding secretariat services, as appropriate, in the light of any additional guidance that may be provided by the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and/or the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement, as appropriate, regarding the Adaptation Fund's transition to exclusively serve the Paris Agreement.

(Decision B.45/1)

Item 7. Assessment of the implications of new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG) decision

20. The representative of the secretariat presented the secretariat's assessment of the implications of the new collective quantified goal on the Fund's operations (AFB/B.45/6), which included three possible scenarios for the Fund's contribution to the collective goal of US\$ 300 billion per year and the broader ambition to scale up financing to US\$ 1.3 trillion per year. He also addressed various comments made and concerns raised during the informal session held on the matter just prior to the Board meeting. In the secretariat's view, he said, the three scenarios outlined in the document would not entail any change to the Fund's mandate or operating model. Eligible parties would continue to receive grant-based funding on a full-cost-of-adaptation basis, driven by their needs, views and priorities and would not incur any debt. They would not be expected to provide co-financing and would continue to choose the implementing entity with whom they wished to work. He noted various concerns raised during the informal session, including with respect to the effectiveness of blended finance; the potential for earmarking to be based on donor, private sector or philanthropic interests and concerns that such funders might change the governance of the fund; the relationship between the US\$ 300 billion target and the broader ambition of scaling up financing to US\$ 1.3 trillion; and the need for direction from the CMA. He also noted that Board members had expressed general interest in receiving more information, including information on the three possible scenarios and their potential impact on the Fund's operations.

21. During the ensuing discussion, members expressed appreciation for the secretariat's report and generally recognized it as being intended to generate discussion, although one said that the discussion at the Board's forty-fourth meeting had only called for the secretariat to review the funding caps with a view to supporting the mandate to tripling the funding outflow, not a full analysis or interpretation of the decision on the new collective quantified goal on climate finance (NCQG).

22. Several members indicated an interest in further exploring scenario 3, saying that it offered the best chance of meeting the NCQG, although individual members flagged the need to further explore how the funds would be channelled and the impact of a tripled outflow on the recipients' side, as well as the eventual need for a framework to enable joint investment by accredited entities such as multilateral development banks, as well as for technical reviews, system enhancements and improvement in performance measurement to establish funding windows.

23. Other suggestions of areas for further analysis included the Fund's role in the overall landscape of climate finance provision and its added value; the track record, in terms of quality, impact and level of finance, of the other organizations providing adaptation finance; and the entire NCQG decision in the light of the Board's comments.

24. Various concerns were also raised or reiterated with respect to scenario 3, as well as scenario 2, including regarding the Fund's capacity to explore new funding instruments given the workload entailed by the recent increases in the project and country caps; the advisability of engaging in new, uncertain and complicated operations; the use of funding modalities that might potentially impose debt or other additional burden on developing countries, even for those that leveraged external funds; and governance issues related to who would decide where the funds went and what they were used for.

25. Following a proposal by one member, the Board agreed to further consider the matter in the context of the discussion under agenda item 8, on the resource mobilization strategy. Therefore, having considered document AFB/B.45/6, the Adaptation Fund Board took note of the documents prepared by the secretariat and the deliberations of the Board on the matter, noting the varying views of the Board members.

Item 8. Resource mobilization strategy

26. A representative of the secretariat presented the draft Adaptation Fund resource mobilization strategy for the period 2026–2029 (AFB/B.45/7).

27. In the ensuing discussion, members underscored the importance of a new resource mobilization strategy for the Fund and said that although the draft strategy was a strong starting point it would require further refinement before they could approve it. They underscored the importance of, among other things, avoiding any impact on the governance of the Fund and its full-cost-of-adaptation and grant-based nature; having a clearly defined resource mobilization process; allowing for technology transfer; integrating the private sector more effectively; ensuring that earmarking did not affect other countries' access to the Fund; and ensuring that strong communication with current donors was not lost in the search for new donors.

28. Some members were in favour of affording the secretariat broad flexibility to develop non-traditional sources of funding and explore policy issues related to the use of innovative approaches to resource mobilization, including engagement with a non-traditional donor base. One also recommended including the private sector's perspective more explicitly in the case for investment in the Fund, including articulating the Fund's role in derisking, enabling market development and offering targeted investment windows potentially aligned with corporate environmental, social and governance priorities. Other members, however, called for caution with respect to private sector investment, saying that such non-traditional financing was only acceptable as a supplement and complement to public financing. Some also said they would not support any innovative sources of funding that would place a burden on developing countries, in particular through the application of international levies or taxes on their consumers, and one cautioned against the introduction of any category of country other than "developed" and "developing".

29. Several members said that it would be important to leave the current resource mobilization strategy in place until a new strategy was approved, and one requested that any draft resource mobilization strategy to be discussed at the forty-sixth Board meeting be sent to members no later than three weeks before travel to the Board meeting began. There was also general support for engaging in intersessional work on the draft strategy.

30. Responding, the Manager of the secretariat acknowledged that the secretariat had limited capacity to implement a targeted resource mobilization strategy. Although all the

secretariat staff contributed to resource mobilization, strategy implementation was a main task of the Countries and Partnerships Unit, which was a small unit, even though it would soon have an additional staff member as approved by the Board at its forty-fourth meeting. He also reminded Board members that the secretariat welcomed any support they could provide as ambassadors of the Fund, including in identifying new contributors and innovative ways of raising funds.

31. Also responding to members' questions, the representative of the secretariat drew attention to the significant increase in the average annual level of resource mobilization under the current strategy compared with the first strategy, which she attributed to the hard work of the Board and secretariat as well as the innovative approaches adopted. Noting that the secretariat had learned from the first two strategies, she drew attention to the case for investment included in the new strategy, an innovative feature that had been added based on feedback from contributors regarding the need to ensure that funding was based on the Fund's impact and results. Finally, she assured the Board that the secretariat was committed to preserving the grant-based nature of the Fund and that the new strategy was entirely based on a country-driven approach built around direct access.

32. The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), having considered the information contained in document AFB/B.45/7, decided to request the secretariat:

(a) To revise the draft resource mobilization strategy for the period 2026–2029 contained in annex I to document AFB/B.45/7, taking into account the Board's discussion at its forty-fifth meeting and guidance from the Board's resource mobilization task force, for the Board's consideration at its forty-sixth meeting;

(b) To consult with the Board during the intersessional period to support the preparation of the next draft;

(c) To continue to implement the current resource mobilization strategy until the next strategy was approved.

(Decision B.45/2)

Item 9. Strategic results framework

33. A representative of the secretariat presented the proposed update to the Adaptation Fund's Strategic Results Framework (AFB/B.45/8), prepared by the secretariat pursuant to the implementation plan for the Fund's Medium-Term Strategy 2023–2027.¹

34. Following the presentation, one Board member sought clarification whether the proposed updates would hinder project funding and increase the burden on implementing entities, as they might not have the requested data on hand and cultural barriers could distort data collection. . Noting that there were costs associated with collecting data, she underscored that information should not be collected for its own sake or as a public relations exercise, that it would be preferable to have indicators that could be applied flexibly, and various collection methods should be considered. Another member added that only the data

¹ AFB/B.40/5/Rev.1.

needed to fulfil the Fund's mandate should be required, and that any changes should not be applied retrospectively.

35. Other members, however, noted that 24 implementing entities had been consulted on the updates, including some that had piloted them. The updates had been country-driven and were meant to create a streamlined process that provided better, disaggregated data; they were unlikely to increase the burden on the implementing entities given that they were already familiar with the results framework.

36. The representative of the secretariat confirmed that the revisions were meant to reduce the reporting requirement on the entities and that data would not be collected for its own sake. She highlighted that the total number of indicators would be reduced through the proposed changes and the updates had been developed in consultation with the implementing entities, based on their feedback on existing indicators. The mandatory reporting requirements for implementing entities would remain unchanged as they only had to report on the indicators relevant to their projects as determined by themselves. She also explained that the secretariat proposed to update outcome and output indicators by incorporating sectoral disaggregation, in order to better align the framework with the crosscutting themes of the medium-term strategy, especially locally led adaptation, and the sector and dimensions approach of the Global Goal on Adaptation targets.

37. The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), having considered the information contained in document AFB/B.45/8, including the development of specific indicators for the innovation and locally led adaptation portfolio and alignment of current indicators with the global goal on adaptation and other developments, decided:

(a) To approve the proposed revisions to the Strategic Results Framework (SRF) as contained in document AFB/B.45/8, taking into account the guidance provided by the Board;

(b) To request the secretariat to revise the project performance report templates as needed and develop a guidance document on the revised SRF and related revised project performance report templates, and to share them with the implementing entities, with the understanding that implementing entities were only required to report, per current practice, on the proposed indicators relevant to their country context, with mandatory alignment to at least one core indicator;

(c) To consult with the Board when preparing the guidance document;

(d) That the SRF would come into effect three months after the revised project performance report templates and guidance documents referred to above were shared with the implementing entities.

(Decision B.45/3)

Item 10. Report of the Accreditation Panel

38. The Chair of the Accreditation Panel presented the report of the Panel's forty-fourth meeting (AFB/B.45/9).

39. Following his presentation, a representative of the secretariat presented the outcome of an in-depth analysis of the Fund's reaccreditation approach (AFB/B.45/9, annex), prepared by the secretariat in response to decision B.44/5.

40. During the ensuing discussion, there was general agreement that a structural change was needed to ease the burden of reaccreditation, particularly on national implementing entities. Several members voiced support for option 3, with individual members noting that it would support institutional effectiveness and performance and fast-track direct access, maintain ongoing control over accreditation and address issues of institutional changes arising from political instability.

41. Other members expressed the view that the Fund was not ready for option 3, citing a variety of reasons, including a lack of adequate resources within the secretariat and substantial cost increases for national implementing entities. Several were instead in favour of extending the accreditation term to 10 years with a mid-term review, but others countered that an extension would not work for all implementing entities, and that it would remove the Board's ability to monitor implementing entities' capacity, as the only monitoring criteria would then be project implementation.

42. Members posed many questions, regarding, among other things, the adequacy of the Fund's current monitoring and accountability frameworks; whether the goal of option 3 was to further align with the GCF processes; the time needed for the secretariat to assess the implications of option 3; and the next steps.

43. Responding, the representative of the secretariat assured the Board that project performance was already an integral factor in reaccreditation; the Panel would not proceed with a reaccreditation without the secretariat's findings on project performance. Furthermore, an implementing entity with no record on project implementation was subject to a full reaccreditation process, while those that had already implemented a project could be fast-tracked through certain steps. On the question of alignment with the GCF, she noted that the Fund had eight years of operational linkage with the GCF on accreditation and reaccreditation. The GCF was overhauling its accreditation process but fast-track accreditation from the Adaptation Fund remained one of the pillars of its framework. The standard for accreditation remained unchanged and would continue to be valid for the continuous accreditation proposed in option 3. Noting the considerable effort invested in accreditation by the countries, Accreditation Panel and secretariat, she stressed that the reason for the proposed changes was to ensure an efficient, effective process for all those involved. .

44. Turning to the question of increased costs for national implementing entities, the representative of the secretariat said that significant increases were not expected under option 3. She explained that there was ongoing discussion between the Accreditation Panel and the various units within the secretariat to ensure that the evidence-based accreditation and reaccreditation process had been validated by all stakeholders, including the implementing entities with respect to added costs. The Fund had operational linkages in place with other multilateral climate funds in readiness as well as accreditation, and ways of enhancing the readiness programme to better support the implementing entities had been discussed during the readiness programme evaluation. Furthermore, as the Accreditation Panel only recommended accreditation once it was sure that the country seeking accreditation had a solid monitoring and compliance handling system and the needed institutional capacity, the most important capacity assessment and strengthening was already done during the accreditation process.

45. In terms of next steps, the representative of the secretariat said that the secretariat would develop a detailed proposal for implementation and transitional arrangements and associated costs for the preferred option and report back to the Board at its forty-sixth meeting.

The secretariat was confident of its ability to report back at the forty-sixth meeting as it had been discussing the matter with the Panel since the forty-fourth meeting. She also assured the Board that no changes would be made to the reaccreditation process prior to the Board's forty-sixth meeting.

46. Also addressing the question of the secretariat's operational capacity, another representative of the secretariat specified that under the proposed options 2 and 3, where the secretariat would serve as the first line of detection and escalation, more upfront work would be required to set up an appropriate information system, and further work would be needed to determine whether the data currently collected annually was sufficient. Once the information requirements and triggers were determined, an automated system and dashboard system would be developed, entailing upfront costs that remained to be estimated.

47. Several members, while supporting further analysis of option 3 by the secretariat, stressed the need for a detailed proposal for implementation that captured the financial and operational risks and the implications in terms of transparency and accountability, and provided clarity for national implementing entities regarding the elements and actions that would lead to the cancellation of accreditation.

48. The Board then closed the session to discuss the matters considered by the Panel at its forty-fourth meeting, following which it adopted the decisions below.

49. The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), having considered document AFB/B.45/9, and recalling its decision B.44/5 requesting the secretariat to assess the operational implications of the current reaccreditation model and develop options for its revision, decided:

(a) To take note of the three options for revising the Adaptation Fund's reaccreditation process as presented in document AFB/B.45/9;

(b) To request the secretariat, taking into account guidance provided by the Board at its forty-fifth meeting and in consultation with the Accreditation Panel, to prepare a detailed proposal for option 3 as presented in document AFB/B.45/9, including the financial and operational implications and transitional period arrangements, as well as any necessary amendments to policies, for consideration by the Board at its forty-sixth meeting.

(Decision B.45/4)

50. Having considered the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to reaccredit the World Food Programme as a multilateral implementing entity of the Adaptation Fund for five years, as per paragraph 39 of the operational policies and guidelines for Parties to access resources from the Adaptation Fund, with an accreditation expiration date of 9 October 2030.

(Decision B.45/5)

Item 11. Report of thirty-sixth meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee

51. The Chair of the PPRC presented the report of the thirty-sixth meeting of the PPRC (AFB/PPRC.36/43).

52. During consideration of the recommendation to endorse the concept note submitted by the World Food Programme for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (AF00000436, a

member representing the Western Europe and Others constituency asked that the following statement be included in the present report:

“Sweden wishes to emphasize the importance of transparency in all aspects of the Fund’s project financing. Equally vital is the consistent and thorough application of the Fund’s established risk and control frameworks. These mechanisms are designed to safeguard the integrity of our operations and to mitigate financial, operational and reputational risks. This is particularly critical in contexts where administrative systems may face challenges related to transparency and accountability. In such cases, we expect the secretariat and the PPRC to exercise heightened diligence, ensuring that project planning, execution and reporting are fully aligned with the Fund’s governance standards.”

53. The Board took note of the report of the PPRC and adopted the decisions below on matters considered by the PPRC at its thirty-sixth meeting.

Approach to initial application of the country cap

54. The Adaptation Fund Board decided to request the secretariat to prepare options concerning access to funding under the country cap, with a view to clarifying and/or updating decision B.36/41, paragraph (a), for the consideration of the Project and Programme Review Committee at its thirty-seventh meeting.

(Decision B.45/6)

(a) Review of single-country project and programme proposals

Single country project and programme proposals: fully developed project proposals – proposals from national implementing entities:

Armenia: Enhancing the Land-based Adaptation of Communities Adjacent to Arid Zones and Forest Protected areas of Armenia by Duplicating and Expanding the Successful Mechanisms of the Previous Projects (fully-developed project; Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU); AF00000363; US\$ 4,097,546)

55. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

(a) To approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To approve the funding of US\$ 4,097,546 for the implementation of the project, as requested by EPIU;

(c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with EPIU as the national implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/7)

Armenia: Enhancing Resilience of Communities to Climate Change in Shirak Marz Leveraging Best Practices of the Pilot Project Implemented in Artik Community (fully-developed project; Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU); AF00000368; US\$ 4,472,630)

56. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

(a) To approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To approve the funding of US\$ 4,472,630 for the implementation of the project, as requested by EPIU;

(c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with EPIU as the national implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/8)

Ethiopia: Transforming Communities: A Nexus of Climate-Smart Agriculture, Livelihood Diversification, and Women's Economic Empowerment (fully-developed project; Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (MOFEC); AF00000410; US\$ 9,999,328)

57. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

(a) To approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Cooperation of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (MOFEC) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To approve the funding of US\$ 9,999,328 for the implementation of the project, as requested by MOFEC;

(c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with MOFEC as the national implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/9)

Indonesia: Sustainable Landscape Governance; Towards Climate Resilience of Community in Tempe Lake Ecosystem (fully-developed project; Partnership for Governance Reform (Kemitraan); AF00000302; US\$ 993,081)

58. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

(a) To approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform (Kemitraan) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To approve the funding of US\$ 993,081 for the implementation of the project, as requested by Kemitraan;

(c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with Kemitraan as the national implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/10)

Indonesia: Building Climate Resilient District in Indonesia: Case of Sigi District (fully-developed project; Partnership for Governance Reform (Kemitraan); AF00000306; US\$ 998,868)

59. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform (Kemitraan) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To approve the funding of US\$ 998,868 for the implementation of the project, as requested by Kemitraan;
- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with Kemitraan as the national implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/11)

Kenya: Adaptation for Water Access and Resilience in Ewaso Nyiro River Basin (fully-developed project; National Environment Management Authority (NEMA); AF00000431; US\$ 20,000,000)

60. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To note the recommendation that the Board:
 - (i) Approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) to the request made in the technical review;
 - (ii) Approve the funding of US\$ 20,000,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by NEMA;
 - (iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with NEMA as the national implementing entity for the project;
- (b) To consider the recommendation under subparagraphs (a) (i)–(iii) above when NEMA has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Decision B.45/12)

Mexico: Ha Ta Tukari, “Water our Life”: Towards Universal Drinking Water Coverage for 21 Communities of the Wixarika Nation (fully-developed project; Mexican Institute of Water Technology (IMTA); AF00000328; US\$ 7,999,991)

61. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To note the recommendation that the Board:
 - (i) Approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Mexican Institute of Water Technology (IMTA) to the request made in the technical review;

(ii) Approve the funding of US\$ 7,999,991 for the implementation of the project, as requested by IMTA;

(iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with IMTA as the national implementing entity for the project;

(b) To consider the recommendation under subparagraphs (a) (i)–(iii) above when IMTA has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Decision B.45/13)

Single country project and programme proposals: fully developed project proposals – proposals from regional implementing entities

Dominican Republic: Enhancing Climate Resilience of Ecosystems and Livelihoods through Adaptation Actions in the Tourism Sector in La Isabela and Estero Hondo, in the Dominican Republic (RESILTUR) (fully-developed project; Development Bank of Latin America (CAF); AF00000397; US\$ 10,000,000)

62. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To note the recommendation that the Board:

(i) Approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Development Bank of Latin America (CAF) to the request made in the technical review;

(ii) Approve the funding of US\$ 10,000,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by CAF;

(iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with CAF as the regional implementing entity for the project;

(b) To consider the recommendation under subparagraphs (a) (i)–(iii) above when CAF has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Decision B.45/14)

Egypt: Climate Change Adaptation to Improve Livelihoods in Siwa Oasis (CCAILSO) (fully-developed project; Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); AF00000331; US\$ 8,000,000)

63. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To note the recommendation that the Board:

(i) Approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) to the request made in the technical review;

(ii) Approve the funding of US\$ 8,000,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by OSS;

(iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with OSS as the regional implementing entity for the project;

(b) To consider the recommendation under subparagraphs (a) (i)–(iii) above when OSS has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Decision B.45/15)

Single country project and programme proposals: fully developed project proposals – proposals from multilateral implementing entities

Grenada: Enhancing the Resilience of Vulnerable Small Island Communities to Climate Change Hazards (ENRICH) (fully developed project; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); AF00000334; US\$ 10,000,000)

64. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

(a) To approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To approve the funding of US\$ 10,000,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by IFAD;

(c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with IFAD as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/16)

Single country project and programme proposals: concept notes – proposals from national implementing entities

Benin: Strengthening Meteorological Services and Establishing a Multi-Hazard Early Warning System to Enhance the Climate Resilience of Local Communities in Benin (concept note; National Fund for Environment and Climate (FNEC); AF00000429; US\$ 4,011,561)

65. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To note the recommendation that the Board:

(i) Endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the National Fund for Environment and Climate (FNEC) to the request made in the technical review;

(ii) Request the secretariat to notify FNEC of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues:

a. The fully-developed project proposal should provide more statistics on gender characteristics, vulnerable groups for all the communes identified in the project proposal;

b. The fully-developed project proposal should provide further assessments required on Environment and Social Policy, a Gender Assessment and a Gender Action Plan;

(iii) Approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 91,800;

(iv) Request FNEC to transmit the observations under subparagraph (a) (ii) to the Government of Benin;

(v) Encourage the Government of Benin to submit, through FNEC, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (a) (ii), above;

(b) To consider the recommendation under subparagraphs (a) (i)–(v) above when FNEC has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Decision B.45/17)

Côte d'Ivoire: Strengthening Access to Drinking Water for Rural Communities in the Central Zone of Côte d'Ivoire to Reduce their Vulnerability to the Effects of Climate Change (concept note; Interprofessional Fund for Agricultural Research (FIRCA); AF00000418; US\$ 10,000,000)

66. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Interprofessional Fund for Agricultural Research (FIRCA) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To request the secretariat to notify FIRCA of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:

(i) The fully-developed project proposal should provide a comprehensive evaluation of all activities to be implemented, as per FIRCA's response to the first technical review;

(ii) The fully-developed project proposal should provide more details on the benefits supported with related statistics;

(c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 150,000;

(d) To request FIRCA to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Côte d'Ivoire;

(e) To encourage the Government of Côte d'Ivoire to submit, through FIRCA, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/18)

Single country project and programme proposals: concept notes – proposals from regional implementing entities

Barbados: Building Climate Resilience in Barbados - Sustainable Water Management in the Agriculture Sector and Educational Institutions (concept note; Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC); AF00000406; US\$ 10,000,000)

67. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To request the secretariat to notify CCCCC of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:

(i) The fully-developed project proposal should include a full cost-benefit analysis and economic impact;

(ii) Ensure that the proposed activities do not overlap with existing programmes in the country;

(c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 149,250;

(d) To request CCCCC to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Barbados;

(e) To encourage the Government of Barbados to submit, through CCCCC, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/19)

Saint Lucia: Replicating Resilient Water Supply Systems Project in Saint Lucia (Re-Water Saint Lucia) (concept note; Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC); AF00000425; US\$ 9,992,305)

68. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To request the secretariat to notify CCCCC of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:

(i) The fully-developed project proposal should provide more details on the activities under each output;

(ii) A detailed gender assessment along with a gender action plan will be required at fully-developed project proposal stage;

(iii) A detailed cost effectiveness analysis should also be provided at fully-developed project proposal stage;

(iv) More consultations with local communities are recommended during the preparation of the fully developed project proposal stage;

(v) Further details on identifying and mitigating risks would be needed at the fully developed project proposal stage;

(c) To request CCCCC to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Saint Lucia;

(d) To encourage the Government of Saint Lucia to submit, through CCCCC, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/20)

Suriname: Climate Resilient Food System Transformation in Suriname (CR-FST) (concept note; Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC); AF00000424; US\$ 9,998,839)

69. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To request the secretariat to notify CCCCC of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:

(vi) The fully-developed project proposal should clarify which agencies or entities will be responsible, how operations will be financed, and what capacity-building measures are planned to secure long-term viability;

(c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 150,000;

(d) To request CCCCC to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Suriname;

(e) To encourage the Government of Suriname to submit, through CCCCC, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/21)

Single country project and programme proposals: concept notes – proposals from multilateral implementing entities

Botswana: Enhancing Climate Resilient Water, Food, and Energy Systems in Botswana through Sustainable Natural Resources Management (concept note; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); AF00000385; US\$ 10,000,000)

70. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To request the secretariat to notify IFAD of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:

(i) The fully-developed project proposal should provide more specific details on the climate and socio-economic information, maps and statistics;

- (ii) The fully-developed proposal should ensure that free, prior and informed consent is given by all potential stakeholders during consultations to be carried out;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 150,000;
- (d) To request IFAD to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Botswana;
- (e) To encourage the Government of Botswana to submit, through IFAD, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/22)

Comoros: Enhancing Youth Entrepreneurship through Climate Resilient Opportunities (ECO-Youth) (concept note; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); AF00000403; US\$ 10,000,000)

71. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify IFAD of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
 - (i) The fully-developed project proposal should provide a further elaborated gender assessment with clear linkages to proposed activities to be integrated into a Gender Action Plan;
 - (ii) The fully-developed project proposal should outline the target areas where vulnerable groups and local/indigenous communities have been identified, as well as the benefits to be provided by the project to those groups;
 - (iii) The fully-developed project proposal should clarify the process to ensure full compliance with applicable technical standards during implementation, especially for activities not yet fully defined;
 - (iv) The fully-developed project proposal should describe how the environmental and social screening and technical compliance will be integrated into the environmental and social management plan and unidentified subprojects (USPs) selection process;
 - (v) The fully-developed project proposal should clearly elaborate the knowledge management and learning strategy, including a structured learning agenda and mechanisms for peer exchange across the 66 villages, and include a clear USP screening and approval process;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 150,000;
- (d) To request IFAD to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of the Comoros;

(e) To encourage the Government of the Comoros to submit, through IFAD, a fully developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/23)

Djibouti: Climate Change Adaptation in the Great Green Wall National Corridor (Adapt-GMV) (concept note; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); AF00000402; US\$ 9,996,630)

72. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To request the secretariat to notify IFAD of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:

(i) The fully-developed project proposal should provide a more detailed vulnerability assessment of the target areas and populations, including how different magnitudes of climate change might affect vulnerability and analysis of adaptive capacity under different scenarios;

(ii) The fully-developed project proposal should provide additional information on strengthening mechanisms for learning monitoring, and post-project knowledge sustainability;

(iii) The fully-developed proposal should provide more detailed analyses including quantitative comparison of the cost-effectiveness of the proposed measures with alternative adaptation measures;

(iv) The fully-developed proposal should provide a more detailed gender assessment;

(c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 135,625;

(d) To request IFAD to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Djibouti;

(e) To encourage the Government of Djibouti to submit, through IFAD, a fully developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/24)

Morocco: Strengthening Climate Change Resilience of Urban Residential Neighbourhoods in the Tangier-Tetouan-Al Hoceima Region (concept note; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); AF00000409; US\$ 9,171,939)

73. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To note the recommendation that the Board:

(v) Endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made in the technical review;

(vi) Request the secretariat to notify UN-Habitat of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:

a. The fully-developed project proposal should refer to the guidance document on unidentified sub-projects. Implementing entities are encouraged to consult with the Adaptation Fund secretariat on matters related to unidentified sub-projects during full project formulation;

(vii) Request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Morocco;

(viii) Encourage the Government of Morocco to submit, through UN-Habitat, a fully developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (a) (ii), above;

(b) To consider the recommendation under subparagraphs (a) (i)–(iv) above when UN-Habitat has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Decision B.45/25)

Philippines: Agricultural Interventions for Development: Harnessing and Enhancing Adaptation and Resilience Tools and Strategies for the Philippine Fruit and Vegetable Industry (concept note; United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); AF00000437; US\$ 10,000,000)

74. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To request the secretariat to notify UNIDO of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:

(i) The fully-developed project proposal should provide more demonstration of how the project will address its adaptation objective and include a more comprehensive list of projects that are or have been implemented in the Philippines and are related to the proposed project;

(c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 150,000;

(d) To request UNIDO to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Philippines;

(e) To encourage the Government of Philippines to submit, through UNIDO, a fully developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/26)

Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of: Strengthening the Resilience of Communities, their Livelihoods, and Ecosystems to the Impacts of Climate Change in the Turimiquire Mountain Massif Protective Zone (concept note; World Food Programme (WFP); AF00000436; US\$ 10,000,000)

75. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the World Food Programme (WFP) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify WFP of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
 - (i) The fully-developed project proposal should outline plans for monitoring vegetation recovery and community participation in restoration efforts;
 - (ii) The fully-developed project proposal should explicitly mention if specific aspects related to knowledge management are expected and include details on the activities to further substantiate/quantify the work to be undertaken (e.g. number of capacity-building training sessions);
 - (iii) At the fully-developed project proposal stage, WFP will further analyse available data; engage national institutions, university experts and government in a dedicated workshop to prioritize sites; and conduct field visits and community consultations to refine/validate the prioritized specific intervention sites. Environmental and social screening, a gender assessment and stakeholder consultations will be conducted in Year 1 after site selection, if unidentified subprojects remain;
 - (iv) The fully-developed project proposal stage should include a detailed gender analysis and gender action plan and a more detailed cost-effectiveness analysis;
- (c) To request WFP to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela;
- (d) To encourage the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela to submit, through WFP, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/27)

(b) Review of regional project and programme pre-concept notes

Regional project and programme proposals: pre-concept notes from multilateral implementing entities

Angola, Mozambique: Enhancing Rural Access to Climate Adaptation Technologies, Products and Services (pre-concept note; United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); AF00000441; US\$ 30,000,000)

76. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the pre-concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify UNIDO of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 30,000;
- (d) To encourage the Governments of Angola and Mozambique to submit, through UNIDO, a concept note.

(Decision B.45/28)

Georgia, Republic of Moldova, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan: Agriculture Climate Resilient Outcomes Platform (Agri-CROP) (formerly Climate-smart Agriculture and Resilience Platform for Expedited Transition (CARPET)) (pre-concept note; European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD); AF00000423; US\$ 30,000,000)

77. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the pre-concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify EBRD of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
 - (i) The concept note should include an estimate of the number of direct and indirect beneficiaries, which is a core indicator required by the Fund, and include the exact allocation per country, if possible;
 - (ii) The concept note should include further detailed process and associated selection criteria, particularly when the proposal involves multiple layers to reach the final beneficiaries;
 - (iii) The concept note should provide additional information to satisfy the criteria on unidentified subprojects, specifically identifying the kinds of activities and acceptable locations;
- (c) To request EBRD to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Georgia, the Republic of Moldova, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan;
- (d) To encourage the Governments of Georgia, the Republic of Moldova, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan to submit, through EBRD, a concept note that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/29)

Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan: Integrated Drought Management for Central Asia (IDCA) (Pre-concept note; World Meteorological Organization (WMO); AF00000420; US\$ 13,915,000)

78. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the pre-concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify WMO of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 39,000;
- (d) To request WMO to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan;
- (e) To encourage the Governments of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan to submit, through WMO, a concept note that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/30)

Malawi, United Republic of Tanzania: Promoting Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Change in the Songwe River Basin (pre-concept note; United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); AF00000428; US\$ 13,999,000)

79. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the pre-concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify UNEP of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
 - (i) The concept note should ensure that capacity building activities include opportunities for feedback and assessment to ensure that the intended technologies are understood and adjustments can be made for future training activities to be more effective;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 30,000;
- (d) To request UNEP to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Malawi and the United Republic of Tanzania;
- (e) To encourage the Governments of Malawi and the United Republic of Tanzania to submit, through UNEP, a concept note that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/31)

Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe: Building Climate-Resilient WASH Services in Southern Africa (Pre-concept note; World Health Organization (WHO); AF00000419; US\$ 18,644,000)

80. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To endorse the pre-concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the World Health Organization (WHO) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify WHO of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
 - (i) The concept note should provide further clarification on the gap analysis and adoption of existing local solutions as well as evidence-based approaches with conservation effectively considered including comparative analysis with alternative options and environmental risk assessments;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 20,000;
- (d) To request WHO to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe;
- (e) To encourage the Governments of Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe to submit, through WHO, a concept note that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/32)

(c) Review of single-country locally led adaptation pre-concept notes

Single-country locally led adaptation proposals: pre-concept notes – proposals from a multilateral implementing entities

Cambodia: Enhancing Livelihood and Climate Adaptation through Nature-based Solutions in Heritage Protected Areas in Siem Reap Province, Cambodia (pre-concept note; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); AF00000456; US\$ 4,999,420)

81. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To note the recommendation that the Board:
 - (i) Endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made in the technical review;
 - (ii) Request the secretariat to notify UN-Habitat of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following recommendations:
 - a. The concept note should provide additional detail on the locally led adaptation modality, specifically the criteria and process for how community organizations will be identified and selected;

- b. The concept note should provide the initial consultation report and initial gender assessment as required by the Environment and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund;
- (iii) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 30,000;
- (iv) To request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Cambodia;
- (v) To encourage the Government of Cambodia to submit, through WFP, a fully developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (a) (ii), above;
- (b) To consider the recommendation under subparagraphs (a) (i)–(v) above when UN-Habitat has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Decision B.45/33)

Lebanon: Nature-based Water Management & Data-Driven Strategy for Climate Resilience in Akkar, Lebanon (pre-concept note; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); AF00000446; US\$ 5,000,000)

82. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To note the recommendation that the Board:
 - (i) Endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made in the technical review;
 - (ii) Request the secretariat to notify UN-Habitat of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following recommendations:
 - a. The concept note should demonstrate how the project will operationalize autonomous decision making by local institutions;
 - b. The concept note should clarify the specific mechanisms for devolving decision-making authority and funding to local entities;
 - c. The concept note should provide the initial consultation report and initial gender assessment as required by the Environment and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Adaptation Fund;
 - (iii) To approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 50,000;
 - (iv) To request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph (a) (ii) to the Government of Lebanon;
 - (v) To encourage the Government of Lebanon to submit, through UN-Habitat, a concept note proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph (a) (ii), above;
- (b) To consider the recommendation under subparagraphs (a) (i)–(v) above when UN-Habitat has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(d) Review of locally led adaptation aggregator proposals

Review of locally led adaptation aggregator proposals: proposals from regional implementing entities

Latin America and Caribbean (LAC): Adapting Biodivercities (ABC) Regional Programme for Latin American and Caribbean Cities Adapting to Climate Change through Locally Led Actions (fully developed proposal; Development Bank of Latin America (CAF); AF00000457; US\$ 12,000,000)

83. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

(a) To note the recommendation that the Board:

(i) Approve the fully developed proposal as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Development Bank of Latin America (CAF) to the request made in the technical review;

(ii) Approve the funding of US\$ 12,000,000 for implementation of the programme, as requested by CAF;

(iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with CAF as the regional implementing entity for the programme;

(b) To consider the recommendation under subparagraphs (a) (i)–(iii) above when CAF has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Decision B.45/35)

Review of locally led adaptation aggregator proposals: proposal from multilateral implementing entities

Africa: Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Programme for Locally led Adaptation (IPLA LLA) (fully-developed proposal; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); AF00000447; US\$ 10,000,000)

84. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

(a) To approve the fully-developed proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To approve the funding of US\$ 10,000,000 for the implementation of the programme, as requested by UNDP;

(c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UNDP as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/36)

(e) Review of large innovation project and programme proposals

Review of large innovation project and programme proposals: proposals from national implementing entities

Belize: Securing Water Resources through Solar Energy and Innovative Adaptive Management (SEAM) (fully-developed proposal; Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT); AF00000272; US\$ 5,000,000)

85. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To approve the fully-developed proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To approve the funding of US\$ 5,000,000 for the implementation of the programme, as requested by PACT;
- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with PACT as the national implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/37)

Uganda: ACCESS (Adaptive and Affordable Clean Cooking Enables Sustainable Solutions - in Masaka) (fully-developed proposal; MWE; AF00000386; US\$ 5,000,000)

86. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To not approve the fully-developed proposal, as supplemented in the clarification responses provided by the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To invite MWE to resubmit the proposal as a concept note, along with a project formulation grant that addresses the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
 - (i) The concept note should strengthen the climate rationale by presenting localized scenarios and demonstrating how restoration and clean cooking components are integrated to deliver coherent adaptation outcomes;
 - (ii) The concept note should enhance innovation and technical design by clarifying the innovation justification of the proposed interventions;
 - (iii) The concept note should include an initial gender assessment and initial consultation reports in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Adaptation Fund;
- (c) To request MWE to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Uganda;
- (d) To encourage the Government of Uganda to submit, through MWE, a concept note that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.45/38)

Review of large innovation project and programme proposals: proposal from multilateral implementing entities

Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia: Balkan Climate Adaptation Futures: A Regional Innovation Initiative for Resilience (fully-developed proposal; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); AF00000448; US\$ 5,000,000)

87. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To approve the fully-developed proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To approve the funding of US\$ 5,000,000 for the implementation of the programme, as requested by UNDP;
- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UNDP as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/39)

Kenya, Uganda: Unlocking investments in Gender and Youth-inclusive Early-grown Stage Adaptation Small and Medium-sized Enterprises in Kenya and Uganda (fully-developed proposal; United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); AF00000276; US\$ 5,000,000)

88. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To approve the fully-developed proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To approve the funding of US\$ 5,000,000 for the implementation of the programme, as requested by UNIDO;
- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UNIDO as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/40)

The Gambia, United Republic of Tanzania: Enhancing Hydromet Services through Regional Monitoring Innovation Hubs in Africa (fully-developed proposal; World Meteorological Organization (WMO); AF00000288; US\$ 4,998,000)

89. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To approve the fully-developed proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) to the request made in the technical review;
- (b) To approve the funding of US\$ 4,998,000 for the implementation of the programme, as requested by WMO;

(c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with WMO as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/41)

(f) Review of AFCIA proposals

Review of AFCIA proposals: proposals from regional implementing entities

Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu : SPC's Climate Innovation Co:Lab (fully-developed proposal; Pacific Community; AF00000449; US\$ 5,000,000)

90. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

(a) To approve the fully-developed proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Pacific Community to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To approve the funding of US\$ 5,000,000 for the implementation of the programme, as requested by the Pacific Community;

(c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with the Pacific Community as the regional implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/42)

(g) Review of learning and innovation bundled proposals

Review of learning and innovation bundled proposals: proposals from national implementing entities

Learning and innovation bundled proposals

Costa Rica: Rise Up Climate: Empowering Communities Through Learning and Innovation in Costa Rica Agriculture (fully-developed proposal; Fundecooperación para el Desarrollo Sostenible (Fundecooperacion); AFRDG00082; US\$ 750,000)

91. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

(a) To approve the fully-developed proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by Fundecooperación para el Desarrollo Sostenible (Fundecooperación) to the request made in the technical review;

(b) To approve the funding of US\$ 750,000 for the implementation of the programme, as requested by Fundecooperación;

(c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with Fundecooperación as the national implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.45/43)

(h) Review of Adaptation Fund Climate Innovation Accelerator expressions of interest

92. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To invite Development Bank of Latin America (CAF) to develop a programme proposal for an amount of up to US\$ 8 million;
- (b) To invite European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) to develop a programme proposal for an amount of up to US\$ 15 million;
- (c) To invite International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to develop a programme proposal for an amount of up to US\$ 10 million;
- (d) To invite the World Bank (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) (IBRD) to develop a programme proposal for an amount of up to US\$ 15 million;
- (e) To invite the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to develop a programme proposal for an amount of up to US\$ 15 million;
- (f) To invite the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to develop three regional programme proposals for up to US\$ 5 million each for the Asia-Pacific, Arab and African States, and to consider submitting them under the Large Grants for Innovation funding window;
- (g) To request the implementing entities invited under subparagraphs (a)–(f) above to indicate acceptance of the invitation to join the Adaptation Fund Climate Innovation Accelerator partnership;
- (h) To invite the implementing entities to prepare programme proposals, in line with the full cost of adaptation principle, using the process elaborated in document AFB/PPRC.31/59, for the consideration of the Board at its forty-sixth meeting.

(Decision B.45/44)

(i) Review of decommitment of unutilized project formulation grants

Costa Rica (Fundecooperación)

93. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to decommit the project formulation grant of US\$ 50,000 approved through decision B.38/15 for the project “Increasing the Resilience of Vulnerable Populations in Costa Rica by Scaling Up Adapta2+” for Costa Rica (AF00000257, Fundecooperación).

(Decision B.45/45)

Cuba, Panama (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations)

94. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to decommit the project formulation grant of US\$ 100,000 approved through decision B.37/20 for the project “Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity of Coastal Communities of Cuba and Panama to Climate Change through the

Binational Exchange of Best Practices for Climate Management and Local Food Security” for Cuba and Panama (AF00000266, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations).

(Decision B.45/46)

Chad, Sudan (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations)

95. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to decommit the Project Formulation Grant of US\$ 100,000 approved through decision B.36/16 for the project “Strengthening Resilience to Climate and Covid-19 Shocks through Integrated Water Management on the Sudan – Chad Border Area (SCCIWM)” for Chad and Sudan (AF00000248, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations).

(Decision B.45/47)

(j) Review of post-approval requests for major changes

Major change, Bangladesh (United Nations Development Programme)

96. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

(a) To approve the request for changes in outputs and targets for the project “Adaptation Initiative for Climate Vulnerable Offshore Small Islands and Riverine Charland in Bangladesh”, as requested by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP);

(b) To request the secretariat to draft an amendment to the agreement between the Board and UNDP to reflect changes made under subparagraph (a).

(Decision B.45/48)

No-cost extension of the project completion date, Chile (Agencia chilena de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo)

97. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to approve the request for a four-month no-cost extension of the project completion date from 9 October 2025 to 9 February 2026 for the project “Water Security: Improving Access to Water during Emergency Situations in the City of Quilpué, Valparaiso Region”.

(Decision B.45/49)

Item 12. Report of thirty-sixth meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee

98. The Vice-Chair of the EFC presented the report of the thirty-sixth meeting of the EFC (AFB/EFC.36/9).

99. One member raised a concern regarding wording used in the narrative text under item 4 of the report and asked that in future EFC meetings language used in reference to contributions and potential contributors be aligned with how such issues were addressed by the Board. He further requested a clarification regarding the recommendation under item 8 (c),

on the report on the implementation of the Evaluation Policy, including the initial management action tracker, with respect to the documents listed for updating in subparagraph (b) of the recommendation. Responding, a representative of the secretariat said that the listed documents were existing documents that helped entities prepare projects. They currently referred to the guidance on evaluation that was used before the evaluation policy came into effect and therefore needed to be updated to refer to the new evaluation policy approved by the Board.

100. The Board took note of the report of the EFC and adopted decisions on matters considered by the EFC at its thirty-sixth meeting as indicated below.

Annual performance report for fiscal year 2025

101. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To approve the Adaptation Fund's annual performance report for the fiscal year 2025, as contained in annex I to document AFB/EFC.36/2;
- (b) To request the secretariat to prepare a summary version of the annual performance report for the general public, in a reader-friendly, graphically designed format.

(Decision B.45/50)

Report of the Chair of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund: readiness evaluation report

102. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To take note of the key findings and recommendations of the draft thematic evaluation of the readiness programme of the Adaptation Fund contained in document AFB/EFC.36/7;
- (b) To request the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG) to finalize the thematic evaluation of the readiness programme of the Adaptation Fund;
- (c) To take note of the draft management response to the findings and recommendations of the thematic evaluation of the readiness programme of the Adaptation Fund contained in document AFB/EFC.36/7;
- (d) To request the secretariat to finalize its management response to that evaluation;
- (e) To request the AF-TERG and the secretariat to present intersessionally, prior to the forty-sixth meeting of the Board, the thematic evaluation of the readiness programme and the management response to the evaluation.

(Decision B.45/51)

*Report of the Chair of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund:
report on the implementation of the Evaluation Policy, including the initial management
action tracker*

103. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To take note of the evaluation policy implementation progress report and management tracker;

(b) To request the secretariat to review and, where appropriate, update the proposal submission templates and guidance documents to include references to the Board's agreed evaluation policy, mandatory project/programme evaluations and evaluation budget allocation;

(c) To request the secretariat, in consultation with the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG), to revise relevant documents to further clarify:

(i) The provisions for conducting final evaluations of projects and programmes of varying sizes and funding windows, in line with the interpretation that final evaluations are not necessary for readiness and small grants (learning and innovation);

(ii) Mid-term review requirements for projects that were initially less than four years in duration but have since been extended beyond the four-year mark;

(d) To request the AF-TERG, in consultation with the secretariat, to develop an evaluation policy guidance document for baseline data reports;

(e) To request the secretariat to clarify whether the allocation of 1–5 per cent of the total project budget for evaluations applied exclusively to mid-term reviews and final evaluations or included baseline data reports as well;

(f) To request the secretariat and the AF-TERG to update the Ethics and Finance Committee, at its thirty-seventh meeting, on the progress made on the requests in subparagraphs (b) through (e) above.

(Decision B.45/52)

Item 13. Update to the Adaptation Fund's Environmental and Social Policy

104. The Board did not take up agenda item 13 owing to a lack of time.

Item 14. Update on the safeguarding against sexual exploitation and abuse and harassment (SEAH) policy

105. The Board did not take up agenda item 14 owing to a lack of time.

Item 15. Enhancing civil society organization engagement

106. The Board did not take up agenda item 15 owing to a lack of time.

Item 16. Carbon footprint of the Fund

107. The Board did not take up agenda item 16 owing to a lack of time.

Item 17. Election of officers for the next period of office

108. Introducing the item, a representative of the secretariat recalled that, pursuant to paragraph 10 of the Rules of procedure of the Adaptation Fund Board, paragraphs 4 and 5 of the General Guidelines for Committees and paragraph 8 of the terms of reference for the Board's Accreditation Panel, the Board was to elect the following officers for the period of office starting at its forty-sixth meeting:

- Board Chair, from a non-Annex I Party
- Board Vice-Chair, from an Annex I Party
- EFC Chair, from an Annex I Party
- EFC Vice-Chair, from a non-Annex I Party
- PPRC Chair, from a non-Annex I Party
- PPRC Vice-Chair, from an Annex I Party
- Accreditation Panel Chair, from an Annex I Party
- Accreditation Panel Vice-Chair, from a non-Annex I Party

109. As several members indicated that they wished to have more time to consult on the matter, the Board agreed to elect the officers in question during the intersession period prior to its forty-sixth meeting.

Item 18. Date and venue of next meetings

110. The Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (g) To hold its forty-sixth meeting from 6 to 10 April 2026 in Bonn, Germany;
- (h) To hold its forty-seventh meeting from 5 to 9 October 2026 in Bonn, Germany
- (i) To request the secretariat, in consultation with the Chair and the Vice-Chair, to make provisions to facilitate, at the earliest possible moment and as necessary, including by possibly adding additional days to the periods in (a) and (b), Board decisions to revise and conclude, as appropriate, the draft memorandum of understanding with the Global Environment Facility Council for secretariat services to the Adaptation Fund Board and terms and conditions of services to be provided by the World Bank as trustee, as per any relevant guidance by the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto

Protocol and/or the Conference of the Parties serving as a Meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement, as appropriate.

(Decision B.45/53)

Item 19. Implementation of the code of conduct

111. The Vice-Chair drew attention to the Code of Conduct and the Zero Tolerance Policy on fraud and corruption, which were posted on the Fund website, and asked whether any member had any issue to raise. No issues were raised.

Item 20. Other matters

112. The Board did not take up agenda item 20 owing to a lack of time.

Item 21. Adoption of the report

113. The Board adopted the decisions in the present report at its forty-fifth meeting and agreed to entrust the finalization of the report to the secretariat for later adoption. The present report was subsequently adopted by the Board during the intersessional period following its forty-fifth meeting.

Item 22. Closure of the meeting

114. The Vice-Chair declared the meeting closed at 6.20 p.m. on 10 October 2025.

ANNEX I

ATTENDANCE AT THE FORTY-FIFTH MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

1. The following members and alternates attended the forty-fifth meeting of the Board:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Constituency</i>
<i>Members</i>		
Washington Zhakata	Zimbabwe	Africa
Do Ik Kim	Republic of Korea	Asia-Pacific
Abdulaziz Albutti	Saudi Arabia	Asia-Pacific
Elchin Allahverdiyev	Azerbaijan	Eastern Europe
Kenrick Williams	Belize	Latin America and the Caribbean
Bertha I. Argueta Tejeda	Honduras	Latin America and the Caribbean
Diann C. Black-Layne	Antigua and Barbuda	Small Island Developing States
Naresh Sharma	Nepal	Least Developed Countries
Maria Luwalhati Dorotan Tiuseco	Philippines	Non-Annex I Parties
Lucas di Pietro	Argentina	Non-Annex I Parties
<i>Alternates</i>		
John Payai Manyok	South Sudan	Africa
Naima Oumoussa	Morocco	Africa
Akram Mirzakhani	Islamic Republic of Iran	Asia-Pacific
Ahmed Waheed	Maldives	Asia-Pacific
Aram Ter-Zakaryan	Armenia	Eastern Europe
Rosa Morales Saravia	Peru	Latin America and the Caribbean
Victor Viñas	Dominican Republic	Latin America and the Caribbean
Frida Jangsten	Sweden	Western Europe and Others
Francisca Molina	Spain	Western Europe and Others
Mani Mate	Cook Islands	Small Island Developing States
Choikhand Janchivlamdan	Mongolia	Non-Annex I Parties
Ahmadou Sebory Touré	Guinea	Non-Annex I Parties

2. The following members and alternates did not attend the forty-fifth meeting of the Board:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Constituency</i>
<i>Members</i>		
Ali Daud Mohamed	Kenya	Africa
Antonio Navarra	Italy	Western Europe and Others
<i>Alternates</i>		
Md Mahmud Hossain	Bangladesh	Least Developed Countries

ANNEX II

Adopted agenda for the forty-fifth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Adoption of the agenda.
3. Report on the activities of the Chair.
4. Report on the activities of the secretariat.
5. Dialogue with civil society organizations
6. Status of the transition of the Adaptation Fund to serve the Paris Agreement
7. Assessment of the implications of the new collective quantified goal for climate finance (NCQG) decision
8. Resource mobilization strategy
9. Strategic results framework
10. Report of the Accreditation Panel.
11. Report of the thirty-sixth meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee.
12. Report of the thirty-sixth meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee.
13. Update to the Adaptation Fund's Environmental and Social Policy.
14. Update on the safeguarding against sexual exploitation and abuse and harassment (SEAH) policy.
15. Enhancing civil society organization engagement.
16. Carbon footprint of the Fund.
17. Election of officers for the next period of office.
18. Date and venue of next meetings.
19. Implementation of the code of conduct.
20. Other matters.
21. Adoption of the report.
22. Closure of the meeting.

ANNEX III

DIALOGUE WITH CIVIL SOCIETY, 9 OCTOBER 2025, BONN, GERMANY

1. The Vice-Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board invited the Board to enter into a dialogue with civil society organizations (CSOs). The dialogue was moderated by a representative of Germanwatch.
2. A representative of HelpAge International explained the actions that CSOs took jointly with the Board and provided examples. The CSO network's online discussion group was a platform for active civil society observers and included some 200 participants. The benefit of CSO engagement were that the Fund had trusted allies to help when strengthening its policy commitments, making its policies more inclusive. The CSO network connected the Fund with hundreds of accredited observers, expanding its reach and visibility, bringing insights from excluded groups and ensuring that its decisions were informed by local realities.
3. A representative of Women's Environment and Development Organization commented on the issues being addressed by Board at its forty-fifth meeting. She said that the new collective quantified goal for climate finance (NCQG) would fundamentally change the Adaptation Fund's funding model by leveraging external funds, potentially undermining its stated goal of tripling its outflow and its grant-based approach. With respect to resource mobilization, she called on the Fund to exceed its targets, set more ambitious resource mobilization "floors"; focus on expanding contributions from existing donors and securing consistent, multi-year contributions; and avoid using fiscal year 2022 as a baseline when assessing financial needs. Turning to the policy on safeguarding against sexual exploitation and abuse and sexual harassment (SEAH), she said that it had positive aspects but could be improved by stating that sexual abuse could be both physical and psychological; including concrete examples of SEAH to help implementing entities recognize it when developing their own policies and capacity; and avoiding references to "good faith", which perpetuated the myth that many SEAH reports were false or malicious. With respect to update of the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy, she averred a number of shortcomings, including a failure to sufficiently address the overlapping issues among vulnerable groups; a lack of clear definitions, standards or guidance for ensuring meaningful engagement; the lack of a list of activities that could not be funded; a lack of clear guidance on the use of free prior and informed consent, intersectional vulnerability assessments and meaningful consultations; the inclusion of unclear project criteria; and the use of aspirational terms instead of enforceable commitments, which weakened accountability. In terms of the strategic results framework, there was a need to explicitly specify those who had been excluded and marginalized and ensure that they were listed in disaggregated reports. Further guidance was needed on intersectional assessments, meaningful consultations and accessible monitoring tools, and to that end community-based organizations had to be included in assessments, consultations and monitoring. On the topic of observer participation, she called for geographic balance and funding for travel and other costs; observer participation in selected closed sessions; and a mechanism for reporting on civil society recommendations. In her view, the elderly, Indigenous Peoples and community-based organizations should not be captured under the broad term "civil society", and funding, capacity-building and logistical support should be made available to marginalized and smaller groups for their participation in Board meetings, consultations and

workshops. CSO recommendations had to be integrated into the Fund's evaluation and learning framework to ensure a measurable influence on Board decisions.

4. A representative of the International Institute for Environment and Development presented issues and lessons learned on the direct access modality. He highlighted the fact that far more funding was being allocated to multilateral implementing entities (MIEs) than to national implementing entities; only 19 small-island developing States or least-developed countries had a national implementing entity accredited with the Green Climate Fund and just 13 had one with the Adaptation Fund. Only 48 direct access projects had been funded across the two funds, and those were concentrated in just 15 countries. Readiness support, a simplified accreditation process and funding criteria were critical to changing that situation, as was a regional or in-country presence. During the question and comment period, Board members generally agreed that the presentation ought to be circulated but had divergent views on the CSO recommendations for SEAH. Some expressed the view that the risks of reputational harm from frivolous, malicious or otherwise unfounded complaints meant that the policy ought to be treated cautiously. Others, however, said that such concerns were overstated, and that the real issue was the abuse of power that underlay SEAH, especially when money was involved. One member stressed the seriousness of such abuse of power and said that any individual or entity with a reputation for tolerating such abuse ought to be prohibited from receiving Adaptation Fund support. With respect to leveraging external funds, some members were surprised that the CSOs expected it to lead to less available funding. The presenters were also asked how equitable and balanced participation from all the different regions could be ensured.

5. Responding to Board member's comments and questions, the representatives of CSO said that regionally balanced and equitable participation by observers in Board meetings could not be ensured unless the travel cost of at least some of the participants were covered; otherwise, the observers would come mainly from the Global North. Addressing the SEAH-related comments, they said that the SEAH policy should not simply offer a remedy for abuse but should serve to prevent it, which was more important, as remedies were inadequate consolation for the victims, who never completely recovered from the abuse. With respect to the NCQG concept note, they called on the Board to remember its mandate, noting that while private sources of funding could open doors, that often came with unanticipated costs. They urged the Board to instead aim to increase the flow of resources based on public sources of funding.

6. The Vice-Chair thanked the civil society organization representatives for their presentations and recommendations and recalled that the Board would discuss civil society's participation in the work of the Board under agenda item 15.

ANNEX IV

SUMMARY OF FUNDING DECISIONS FOR PROJECTS AND PROGRAMMES AT THE FORTY-FIFTH MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

<i>Country</i>	<i>IE</i>	<i>PPRC Document number</i>	<i>NIE funding, USD</i>	<i>RIE funding, USD</i>	<i>MIE funding, USD</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Funding set aside, USD</i>
1. Full Proposals: Single-country							
NIE							
Armenia (1)	EPIU	AFB/PPRC.36/3	4,097,546			<i>Approved</i>	4,097,546
Armenia (2)	EPIU	AFB/PPRC.36/4	4,472,630			<i>Approved</i>	4,472,630
Ethiopia	MOFEC	AFB/PPRC.36/5	9,999,328			<i>Approved</i>	9,999,328
Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.36/6	993,081			<i>Approved</i>	993,081
Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.36/7	998,868			<i>Approved</i>	998,868
Kenya	NEMA	AFB/PPRC.36/8	20,000,000			<i>Pending*</i>	0
Mexico	IMTA	AFB/PPRC.36/9	7,999,991			<i>Pending*</i>	0
RIE							
Dominican Republic	CAF	AFB/PPRC.36/10		10,000,000		<i>Pending*</i>	0
Egypt	OSS	AFB/PPRC.36/11		8,000,000		<i>Pending*</i>	0
MIE							
Grenada	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/12			10,000,000	<i>Approved</i>	10,000,000
Sub-total, USD			48,561,444	18,000,000	10,000,000		30,561,453
2. Concepts: Single-country							
NIE							
Benin	FNEC	AFB/PPRC.36/13	4,011,561			<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Côte d'Ivoire	FIRCA	AFB/PPRC.36/14	10,000,000			<i>Endorsed</i>	0
RIE							
Barbados	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/15		10,000,000		<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Saint Lucia	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/16		9,992,305		<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Suriname	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/17		9,998,839		<i>Endorsed</i>	0
MIE							
Botswana	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/18			10,000,000	<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Comoros	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/19			10,000,000	<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Djibouti	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/20			9,996,630	<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Morocco	UN Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/21			9,171,939	<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Philippines	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/22			10,000,000	<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of	WFP	AFB/PPRC.36/23			10,000,000	<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Sub-total, USD			14,011,561	29,991,144	59,168,569		-
3. Project Formulation Grants (PFG): Single-country concepts							
NIE							

<i>Country</i>	<i>IE</i>	<i>PPRC Document number</i>	<i>NIE funding, USD</i>	<i>RIE funding, USD</i>	<i>MIE funding, USD</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Funding set aside, USD</i>
Benin	FNEC	AFB/PPRC.36/13/Add.1	91,800			<i>Pending*</i>	0
Côte d'Ivoire	FIRCA	AFB/PPRC.36/14/Add.1	150,000			<i>Approved</i>	150,000
RIE							
Barbados	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/15/Add.1		149,250		<i>Approved</i>	149,250
Suriname	CCCCC	AFB/PPRC.36/17/Add.1		150,000		<i>Approved</i>	150,000
MIE							
Botswana	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/18/Add.1			150,000	<i>Approved</i>	150,000
Comoros	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/19/Add.1			150,000	<i>Approved</i>	150,000
Djibouti	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.36/20/Add.1			135,625	<i>Approved</i>	135,625
Philippines	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/22/Add.1			150,000	<i>Approved</i>	150,000
Sub-total, USD			241,800	299,250	585,625		1,034,875
TOTAL (1+2+3)			62,814,805	48,290,394	69,754,194		31,596,328
4. Pre-concepts: Regional							
MIE							
Angola, Mozambique	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/24			30,000,000	<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Georgia, Republic of Moldova, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan	EBRD	AFB/PPRC.36/25			30,000,000	<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/26			13,915,000	<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Malawi, United Republic of Tanzania	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.36/27			13,999,000	<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe	WHO	AFB/PPRC.36/28			18,644,000	<i>Endorsed</i>	0
Sub-total, USD			-	-	106,558,000		-
5. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) Pre-concepts: Regional							
MIE							
Angola, Mozambique	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/24/Add.1			30,000	<i>Approved</i>	30,000

<i>Country</i>	<i>IE</i>	<i>PPRC Document number</i>	<i>NIE funding, USD</i>	<i>RIE funding, USD</i>	<i>MIE funding, USD</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Funding set aside, USD</i>
Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/26/Add.1			39,000	Approved	39,000
Malawi, United Republic of Tanzania	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.36/27/Add.1			30,000	Approved	30,000
Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe	WHO	AFB/PPRC.36/28/Add.1			20,000	Approved	20,000
Sub-total, USD			-	-	119,000		119,000
TOTAL (4+5)					106,677,000		119,000
6. Pre-Concept: Single Country LLA							
MIE							
Cambodia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/29			4,999,420	Endorsed	0
Lebanon	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/30			5,000,000	Endorsed	0
Sub-total, USD			-	-	9,999,420		-
7. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) Pre-Concept: Single Country LLA							
MIE							
Cambodia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/29/Add.1			30,000	Pending*	0
Lebanon	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.36/30/Add.1			50,000	Pending*	0
Sub-total, USD			-	-	80,000		-
8. Full Proposals: LLA Aggregator							
RIE							
Regional [Latin America and Caribbean]	CAF	AFB/PPRC.36/31		12,000,000		Pending*	0
MIE							
Regional [Africa]	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.36/32			10,000,000	Approved	10,000,000
Sub-total, USD			-	12,000,000	10,000,000		10,000,000
TOTAL (6+7+8)			-	12,000,000	20,079,420		10,000,000
9. Full Proposals Single Country: Large Innovation Projects							
NIE							
Belize	PACT	AFB/PPRC.36/33	5,000,000			Approved	5,000,000
Sub-total, USD			5,000,000	-	-		5,000,000
10. Full Proposals Regional: Large Innovation Projects							

<i>Country</i>	<i>IE</i>	<i>PPRC Document number</i>	<i>NIE funding, USD</i>	<i>RIE funding, USD</i>	<i>MIE funding, USD</i>	<i>Decision</i>	<i>Funding set aside, USD</i>
MIE							
Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.36/34			5,000,000	Approved	5,000,000
Kenya, Uganda	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC.36/35			5,000,000	Approved	5,000,000
The Gambia, United Republic of Tanzania	WMO	AFB/PPRC.36/36			4,998,000	Approved	4,998,000
Sub-total, USD			-	-	14,998,000		14,998,000
TOTAL (9+10)			5,000,000	-	14,998,000		19,998,000
11. Full Proposal: AFCIA Programme							
RIE							
Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu	SPC	AFB/PPRC.36/37		5,000,000		Approved	5,000,000
Sub-total, USD			-	5,000,000	-		5,000,000
12. Bundled Innovation-Learning grants							
RIE							
Costa Rica	FDSCR	AFB/PPRC.36/38	750,000			Approved	750,000
Sub-total, USD			750,000	-	-		750,000
GRAND TOTAL (1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8+9+10+11+12)			68,564,805	65,290,394	211,508,614		67,463,328