



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/B.14/4
June 14, 2011

Adaptation Fund Board
Fourteenth Meeting
Bonn, June 21-22, 2011

Agenda item 5

REPORT OF THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE ACCREDITATION PANEL

WORK OF THE PANEL

1. The Accreditation Panel (Panel) continued its work reviewing both new and existing applications. Prior to meeting, the Panel members exchanged information and views on the applications under review. On May 16 and 17, 2011, the Panel held its sixth face-to-face meeting at the secretariat's premises in Washington, D.C. The Panel meeting also allowed for the opportunity to hold teleconferences with applicants, to communicate application status, to ask questions, and to provide direct guidance on additional documentation required.

2. The Panel considered two new NIEs, two new Regional NIEs, and one new MIE applications for accreditation. The Panel also reviewed the results of a field visit to two applicant institutions, and four other NIE applications that were previously reviewed but required additional information for the Panel to make its recommendations.

3. As outlined in the operational policies and guidelines, these applications were initially screened by the secretariat. The list of all applications for accreditation under review by the Panel before the 14th Board meeting included eight applications from potential NIEs, two applications from potential Regional NIEs, and two applications from a potential MIE. By the time of the finalization of the present report, the Panel concluded the review of the following applications:

- 1) National Environment Fund of Benin (NEF)
- 2) Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (BOAD)
- 3) National Implementing Entity 1

4. Eight further applications, five for potential NIEs, one for a potential Regional NIE, and one potential MIE, are still under review by the Panel. For purposes of confidentiality, a numbering system has been used to report on the status of each Implementing Entity's application.

- 1) National Implementing Entity 2
- 2) National Implementing Entity 3
- 3) National Implementing Entity 4
- 4) National Implementing Entity 5
- 5) National Implementing Entity 6
- 6) National Implementing Entity 7
- 7) Regional National Implementing Entity 8
- 8) Multilateral Implementing Entity 1
- 9) Multilateral Implementing Entity 2

National Environment Fund of Benin (NEF)

5. The application with supporting documentation was received by the secretariat on October 8, 2010 by hard copy. The secretariat forwarded the application to the Accreditation Panel on October 26, 2010. Following the fourth Accreditation Panel meeting, the secretariat on behalf of the Panel requested further documentation on November 18, 2010. Documentation was submitted via DHL hard copy on December 15, 2010 that was difficult to scan. The secretariat forwarded the hard copy

documentation to an expert Panel member who reviewed the documentation and presented his findings.

6. Based on his review the Panel concluded during its fourth meeting that the NEF appeared to be a reasonable candidate for accreditation and recommended a field visit to collect the required information, examine in detail various project documents and conduct face to face discussions. This was approved by decision B.13/4. An expert member of the Panel and a representative from the secretariat conducted the field visit from June 6-9, 2011.

7. The field visit mission report revealed that NEF has a small staff dedicated to identifying, evaluating and monitoring the execution of projects. The staff could demonstrate its capabilities which related to relatively small projects. It operates under a strong legal mandate that provides them authority and defines the governing structures. This includes a Board of Directors that approve all projects and that is informed of their execution. NEF meets the fiduciary standards relating financial management such as having audited financial statements. Some of the controls that are necessary to meet the fiduciary standards are executed by the Ministry of the Environment, Hygiene, and Urban Planning (MEHU) who for example performs the internal audit function and plays a significant role to identify projects.

8. NEF has, with the support of the MEHU, the requisite institutional capacity. Procurement follows the national legislation and this is reviewed annually by the external auditor. Projects are identified in a number of different ways, evaluated and approved by its Board of Directors. NEF is close to each of its projects and the MEHU has an overriding role in this with semi-annual reporting to its minister. Evidence was provided to demonstrate that problems on projects in the field were monitored, problems observed were addressed and they evaluated projects at their completion.

9. Nevertheless a number of gaps were present that do not enable the Panel to recommend an accreditation without some reservation:

- NEF is an organization with a short history and its experience relates to relatively small projects;
- NEF has experienced a high turnover of staff in key positions and that has had a negative impact on the operations; and
- The manner in which to deal with financial mismanagement and other forms of malpractice are not sufficiently developed, nor easily assessable within neither NEF nor MEHU. However, both organizations were receptive to the Panel suggestion to strengthen this area.

10. Consequently, the Panel recommends that NEF be accredited as the NIE for Benin subject to the following conditions:

- i) That within three months of each year end the external auditor of the NEF informs the AFB secretariat as to whether:
 - a. Key staff was available during the year to monitor, execute and account for AF projects,
 - b. The accounts of AF projects are up to date, and accurately reflected the transactions during the year, and
 - c. All AF project procurements during the year followed national procurement rules

- ii) That before the first disbursement the MEHU and NEF places on their website an anti fraud policy that includes amongst others that:
 - a. It has a zero fraud tolerance in relation to AF and other projects they manage,
 - b. All allegations received will be investigated and complainants will be covered under appropriate whistleblower protection
 - c. A demonstration of an appropriate system whereby allegations of fraud, financial mismanagement and other irregularities that come to the NEF or the MEHU will be recorded and properly investigated.

11. It is estimated that the additional workload for the secretariat is one week of effort per year to read and, if needed, take action on the report of the external auditor.

Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (BOAD)

12. The BOAD was established in 1973 as the development bank for the West African Monetary Union. The application with supporting documentation was received by the secretariat in 2010 by hard copy. The application was screened on April 15, 2011 when it was endorsed by three member countries: Mali, Togo, and Guinea-Bissau in 2011. The secretariat forwarded the application to an expert member of the Accreditation Panel on April 26, 2011. During its sixth meeting, the Panel requested additional information from the applicant.

13. The additional documentation was submitted via hard copy on June 2, 2011. Upon assessment, the expert Panel member estimated that the application had a reasonable chance of meeting the fiduciary standards. An expert member of the Panel and a representative from the AFB secretariat conducted an ad hoc field visit on June 10, 2011 to the applicant entity. The field visit incurred no travel cost to the Adaptation Fund Board.

14. The field visit mission report revealed that the BOAD had the required systems and procedures in place and could demonstrate their effectiveness. However, insufficient resources were allocated to monitoring its projects compared to its own policies. There are two areas where the alignment with the fiduciary standards could be stronger and BOAD has agreed to strengthen its systems:

- To clearly demonstrate its internal control framework and a appropriate draft was presented to the Panel together with a supporting letter from the President; and
- To strengthen its systems to deal with financial mismanagement and other forms of malpractice which is important given that BOAD operates in an area that has a high risk of fraud and mismanagement that could affect its projects.

15. The Panel recommends accreditation of BOAD on the basis that BOAD includes an internal control statement with the financial statements starting in 2011 and that it has in place an investigative function that reflects its needs and the practices of other development banks before the first disbursement is made by the Adaptation Fund and that the effectiveness thereof will be reviewed after two years by the Panel. The Panel also recommends that the AFB instructs the secretariat to include in the legal documentation to be signed with BOAD a requirement to visit each of the open AF projects for a monitoring mission on an annual basis.

National Implementing Entity 1

16. The application for NIE 1 was initially reviewed at the Panel's fourth meeting. The secretariat received notification on April 6, 2011 that the entity decided to formally withdraw its application for accreditation. The country has identified another organization and has indicated its intention to apply for consideration at the Panel's seventh meeting.

National Implementing Entity 2

17. The application with supporting documentation was received by the secretariat on December 31, 2010 electronically, in different languages. The secretariat requested additional documentation, in English. The applicant sent additional information on February 6, 2011. The secretariat forwarded the application to the Accreditation Panel on April 28, 2011. After reviewing the documentation before the sixth Accreditation Panel meeting, the secretariat on behalf of the Panel requested further documentation on May 18, 2011.

18. Further documentation was submitted on June 3, 2011. The secretariat forwarded the documentation to an expert Panel member who reviewed the documentation. The expert member of the Panel also held a teleconference with the entity. Some of the documents submitted were in a language that required translation into English. The expert Panel member needed further clarification from the NIE and is in consultation to obtain necessary information to process the application which will then be discussed among the other Panel members. The Panel will review any additional materials provided when they are made available to the Panel.

National Implementing Entity 3

19. The secretariat initially received an accreditation application from this NIE on September 28, 2010 in hard copy. After requesting further documentation, the secretariat received it, electronically, on October 25, 2010. The secretariat then notified the Panel that NIE's application was ready for review.

20. The Panel reviewed the application of NIE 3. During its fourth meeting, the Panel found that while the application makes extensive reference to legislation and government wide practices to provide evidence of the fiduciary standards, it does not provide evidence or demonstrate that they are adequately applied within the ministry and that the AF projects would be executed in accordance with the fiduciary standards. Additional evidence and demonstration was requested on November 20, 2010 and January 26, 2011 and NIE 3 responded with further documentation on February 11, 2011 and February 15, 2011. A number of interactions with the applicant have occurred since then. On April 15, 2011 the secretariat received additional documents that were shared with the Panel. Additional information was requested again on May 2, 2011.

21. To allow sufficient time to fully engage and liaise with the applicant, and to evaluate additional documentation that is provided, the Panel will defer recommendation on the application of NIE 3, and will consider a field visit (if minimal cost is incurred) as it deems appropriate.

National Implementing Entity 4

22. On October 6, 2010 the secretariat received an application from NIE 4. Following a request for more information, additional documents were submitted on October 25, 2010. The secretariat forwarded the application to the Panel for deliberation at its fifth meeting.

23. The Panel members' requests for clarification were consolidated and shared with NIE 4 on February 22, 2010. The Panel received many additional materials on May 23, 2011 that are under examination by an expert Panel member.

24. The Panel is expected to produce a report on the application by early July 2011. The Panel will review its report, including any additional materials provided, when they are made available to the Panel.

National Implementing Entity 5

25. On May 15, 2010 the secretariat received an application from NIE 5. Following a request for more information, additional documents were submitted on August 12, 2010. On October 4, 2010, the secretariat sent a letter to the Panel indicating that the application was ready for review. Following the fourth Panel meeting, the secretariat, at the request of the Panel, sent a list of additional required documents to the applicant on November 18, 2010.

26. The additional documents requested by the secretariat on behalf of the AP were received and reviewed by an expert member of the Panel. However, further review of these documents is needed to determine if adherence to the fiduciary standards are demonstrated by the applicant.

27. The Panel held a teleconference with the applicant during and after the sixth Panel meeting. As some outstanding issues persist, one of the expert Panel members is in consultation with NIE 5 to seek additional clarification on pending issues before a final decision on the accreditation process is reached. The full Panel will review any additional materials when they are made available to the Panel.

National Implementing Entity 6

28. The application with supporting documentation was received by the secretariat on April 15, 2011 in hard copy. The secretariat requested additional documentation to be sent electronically. The applicant sent additional information electronically on May 2, 2011. The secretariat forwarded the documentation to an expert Panel member who reviewed the documentation on April 28, 2011. After reviewing the documentation before the sixth Accreditation Panel meeting, the secretariat on behalf of the Panel requested further documentation on May 17, 2011 and offered a teleconference to discuss with the applicant the fiduciary standards' requirements.

29. NIE 6 indicated that further documentation would be submitted on June 25, 2011. The Panel notes that huge gaps remain in the NIE's application. The Panel will review any additional materials provided when they are made available to the Panel.

National Implementing Entity 7

30. The application with supporting documentation was received by the secretariat on May 2, 2011 electronically. The secretariat forwarded the application to the Accreditation Panel on May 5, 2011. The Panel reviewed the application of the NIE during its sixth meeting and agreed that the application was strong in relation to the financial and management fiduciary standards although there were some gaps to resolve and it required further amplification of its legal mandate. The requisite institutional capacity including the competencies related to procurement, project preparation and approval, quality at entry review, monitoring, project closure and evaluation all need to be demonstrated as do various aspects of dealing with financial mismanagement and other forms of malpractices. After reviewing the documentation before the sixth Accreditation Panel meeting, the secretariat on behalf of the Panel requested further documentation on May 18, 2011.

31. Further documentation was submitted on June 6, 2011. The secretariat forwarded the documentation to an expert Panel member who reviewed the documentation. The expert member of the Panel held teleconferences with the applicant to clarify the requested documentation. After review, the Panel concluded most or all of the required policies and procedures exist and that these are probably operating effectively but that still needs to be demonstrated. There is a good possibility that the NIE can deliver the required demonstration in June or July 2011. The full Panel will review the documentation and if fully satisfactory intends to ask for intersessional approval from the AFB for accreditation.

Regional National Implementing Entity 8

32. The application with supporting documentation was received by the secretariat on April 21, 2011 in hard copy. The secretariat forwarded the application to the Accreditation Panel on April 28, 2011. After reviewing the documentation before the sixth Accreditation Panel meeting, the secretariat on behalf of the Panel requested further documentation on May 18, 2011.

33. Further documentation was submitted on June 3, 2011. The secretariat forwarded the documentation to an expert Panel member who reviewed the documentation. The expert member of the Panel held teleconferences with the applicant to clarify the requested documentation. After review, the Panel concluded that the applicant showed strong potential of demonstrating compliance the fiduciary standards. The application awaits full Panel consideration but is expected to reach a positive outcome. The full Panel will review the documentation and if fully satisfactory intends to ask for intersessional approval from the AFB for accreditation.

Multilateral Implementing Entity 1

34. On September 20, 2010, an MIE sent an application to the secretariat, which then forwarded the application to the Panel indicating that it was ready for their review.

35. The Panel reviewed the application for MIE 1 during its fourth meeting and agreed that the application was strong in relation to some of the financial and management fiduciary standards although there were some gaps to resolve. There was a need to demonstrate capability through audit reports and other reviews and there were a number of reports on its website indicating less than optimal progress of the projects funded by MIE 1 which required further investigation and documentation.

36. A number of the required documents have been provided but some others are outstanding and are expected in June or latest July. If the documents are satisfactory to formulate an accreditation recommendation then Panel will ask an intersessional approval from the AFB.

Multilateral Implementing Entity 2

37. On April 15, 2011, MIE 2 sent an application to the secretariat, which was then forwarded the application to the Panel indicating that it was ready for their review on April 19, 2011.

38. The Panel reviewed the application for MIE 2 and agreed that the application was strong but required additional documentation, including complete audit reports, status of action items on internal reports, execution rate for projects, project budgets, system for auditing project accounts, and system for monitoring alerts. The secretariat notified the applicant that further information was required for the Panel to complete their review on May 23, 2010. One of the Panel Members is working with MIE 2, and will follow-up on the status of document preparation. The Panel will review any additional materials when they are made available to the Panel.

Response to request for reconsideration of Accreditation Panel recommendation

39. A non-accredited NIE addressed a letter to the secretariat attaching responses to the issues raised by the Panel in its recommendation, and requesting the Board to "*further review the application of [NIE] along with the attached responses and revise their earlier decision*". The secretariat, in consultation with the Chairs of the Board and Panel, forwarded the responses to the Panel for consideration and advice. The Panel found that the response contained new information that was not provided previously. The Panel emphasized that competencies must also be demonstrated, not just identified.

40. A draft letter in response to the specific questions addressed to the Panel is attached as Annex I to the present report for consideration by the Board. Further information will be supplied to the Board during its closed session.

Report on conditional accreditation

41. In AFB decision B.13/9, the Board requested the Panel to prepare a study on the different options for conditional accreditation, taking into consideration the impact that any such additional conditions might have on the resources and work of the secretariat. In the report of the fifth meeting of the Accreditation Panel presented to the 13th AFB meeting, the Panel informed the Board that according to its Term of Reference the Panel

can recommend Conditional Accreditation. This option would be most appropriate when the applicant Implementing Entity (IE) does not fully meet all the fiduciary standards and the Panel is of the view that the conditions can fully compensate for the areas where the fiduciary standards are not met. It informed the Board that the conditions will be formulated such that they would provide full assurance that Adaptation Fund projects are not subject to any additional risk as compared to a situation where a fully accredited entity would implement the project.

42. The issue had been brought before the Board to alert them to possible concerns about the additional impact it would have on the secretariat and its resources, especially if the conditional accreditation entailed additional reporting requirements.

43. Following discussion the Board decided to request the Panel to prepare a study for its 14th meeting on the different options for conditional accreditation, taking into consideration the impact that any such additional conditions might have on the resources and work of the secretariat. The study would take into account all of the Fund's pending policy decisions needed to ensure that a mechanism is in place to guarantee compliance with any associated procedures (i.e. project cancellations, audit requirements, reporting, etc). In the view of the Board any conditional accreditation should also ensure that the agreed fiduciary standards are not compromised.

44. The Panel while considering the request recognized that to date there are only two cases where a condition had been part of an accreditation recommendation. Such experience is too minimal to serve as a base for any study. It also concluded that basing a study on hypothetical cases would be misleading and not be a service to the Board.

45. The Panel has noted the concerns expressed by the Board when discussing this issue at its thirteenth meeting, and will take these into account when formulating any recommendation for accreditation that includes a condition. Specifically it will make certain that:

- The impact on the work and resources of the secretariat is clear;
- The needed mechanisms to ensure compliance with associated procedures such as project cancellation, audit requirements, reporting, etc. are in place; and
- The conditional accreditation does not compromise the fiduciary standards.

Regional workshops on accreditation of NIEs mandated by CMP6 – discussion on workshop content, agenda, and program

46. The Panel continues to deliberate on the most appropriate workshop content to structure the regional workshops on accreditation. At its sixth meeting, an expert member of the Panel presented initial work on a presentation on the fiduciary standards. The Panel also explored different formats and sequence for workshop materials.

47. The proposed agenda for the workshops is contained as Annex II to this report.

Other matters

48. The Panel, in an effort to further encourage and support the accreditation of NIEs, decided to reinforce its practice for responding to applications. Time will be

allocated to have conference calls with all applicants on the second day of the Panel meeting. Following the Panel meeting, greater attention will be given to clarify the list of questions sent to the applicant, after which the expert Panel member assigned to the application would offer a conference call to review the questions and the Panel's expectations.

49. The Panel also discussed issues related to requests for information directed towards the Panel regarding: an NIE applicant adopting an MIE's policies and procedures to attain accreditation, and if the Panel would accredit a newly established entity.

50. Regarding the former issue, the Panel noted that procedures cannot be transplanted or imported and are very dependent on hierarchical structures and competencies available within the organization to follow processes and procedures. The entity would also need to provide evidence of application of those procedures. The Panel also did not have guidance from the Board on the consideration of a NIE/MIE hybrid entity.

51. With respect to the latter issue, the Panel concluded that while the young age of an organization as such is not a reason to deny accreditation, it is crucial that the applicant is able to document past use of the necessary systems related to fiduciary standards. The Panel also expressed the concern that this approach may incentivize the creation of new organizations in developing countries to access funds.

I. RECOMMENDATIONS

Accreditation of National Environment Fund of Benin

52. The Accreditation Panel recommends that NEF be accredited as the NIE for Benin subject to the following conditions:

- i) That within three months of each year end the external auditor of the NEF informs the AFB secretariat as to whether:
 - a. Key staff was available during the year to monitor, execute and account for AF projects,
 - b. The accounts of AF projects are up to date, and accurately reflected the transactions during the year, and
 - c. All AF project procurements during the year followed national procurement rules
- ii) That before the first disbursement the MEHU and NEF places on their website an anti fraud policy that includes amongst others that:
 - a. It has a zero fraud tolerance in relation to AF and other projects they manage,
 - b. All allegations received will be investigated and complainants will be covered under appropriate whistleblower protection
 - c. A demonstration of an appropriate system whereby allegations of fraud, financial mismanagement and other irregularities that come to the NEF or the MEHU will be recorded and properly investigated.

(Recommendation AFB/AP.6/1)

Accreditation of BOAD

53. The Accreditation Panel has concluded to recommend accreditation to BOAD subject to the following conditions:

- i) That BOAD includes an internal control statement with the financial statements starting with the statements of 2011
- ii) That BOAD have in place an investigative function that reflects its needs and the practices of other development banks before the first disbursement is made by the Adaptation Fund and that the effectiveness thereof will be reviewed after two years by the Panel.

54. The Panel also recommends that the AFB instructs the secretariat to include in the legal documentation to be signed with BOAD a requirement to visit each of the open AF projects for a monitoring mission on an annual basis.

(Recommendation AFB/AP.6/2)

Accreditation Panel observations: Intersessional decisions

55. The Accreditation Panel recommends the Adaptation Fund Board allow the Accreditation Panel to submit a recommendation on the accreditation of IEs intersessionally, should the Panel conclude the assessment of additional documentation reviewed lead to a positive recommendation.

(Recommendation AFB/AP.6/3)

Response to request for reconsideration of Accreditation Panel recommendation

56. The Accreditation Panel recommends the Adaptation Fund Board to

- a) Instruct the secretariat to respond to the applicant's letter and matrix, according to the draft letter attached as Annex I to this report and the response matrix shared in the closed session, which addresses the issues raised by the applicant.
- b) Instruct the secretariat to inform the applicant that it may resubmit an application after addressing the requirements of the Board, or identify another applicant institution as the government deems appropriate.

(Recommendation AFB/AP.6/4)

Regional workshops on accreditation of NIEs mandated by CMP6

57. The Accreditation Panel invites the Board to consider and discuss the draft workshop agenda, attached as Annex II.

(Recommendation AFB/AP.6/5)

Annex I: Response to applicant NIE



ADAPTATION FUND

1818 H Street, NW
MSN P4-400
Washington, DC 20433 USA
Tel: 202.473.0508
Fax: 202.522.3240/3245
E-mail: secretariat@adaptation-fund.org

xxxxx, 2011

xxxxxx
xxxxxx

Dear xxxxx,

Reference is made to your letter dated April 27, 2011, requesting a revision of the Adaptation Fund decision on the accreditation of the xxxxxxxxxxxxxx as National Implementing Entity for the Adaptation Fund.

The Accreditation Panel considered the information and comments contained in the chart attached to the above mentioned letter and observed that there are gaps in four important areas, namely: monitoring and evaluation (internal control); anti-fraud policies and procedures; procurement; and external audit control. Since the fiduciary standards for these areas are not met by xxxxxxxx, the Panel is not in a position to recommend its accreditation.

The Panel noted that new information is now available on areas where no information had been provided, either in the accreditation application or during the field visit by one of the Panel's experts. The Panel welcomes the measures xxxxx announced following the Board decision such as strengthening of the internal audit system and hiring of procurement consultants. These policies and procedures were either not in place or no information on them was provided when the Panel first reviewed xxxxx's accreditation application or during the field visit. A demonstration and evidence of the application of these policies and procedures can only be given after they have been applied for some time and that is required so that the Panel can evaluate its execution.

The Panel kindly notes that the Government of xxxxxxx may resubmit an application for xxxxx after addressing the requirements of the Board, or submit a new application nominating a different entity as NIE.

The Panel provided detailed responses to each of the issues raised in the chart attached to your letter. This chart was updated by the Panel and is attached herewith for your reference. Thank you for having given the Accreditation Panel the opportunity to evaluate your additional information.

Sincerely yours,

Marcia Levaggi
Manager
Adaptation Fund Board secretariat

Annex II: Regional Accreditation Workshops - Recommended Agenda

Day	Time	Agenda	Responsibility
Day 1	09:30 – 10:00	Registration of participants	
	10:00 – 10:30	Welcome and Introductions	
		Welcome – Ibrahim Thiaw, UNEP	
		Opening Remarks - UNFCCC Secretariat	
		Opening Remarks – Adaptation Fund Board Member	
	10:30 – 11:00	Participant Interaction and Expectations	
	11:00 – 12:30	Adaptation fund background and accessing resources Objective: Provide overall context of Adaptation Fund and give a broad overview of how resources can be accessed from the fund. Enable participants to gain an in-depth understanding of the key points of the Operational Policies and Guidelines.	
	11:00 – 11:15	Background on AF as part of overall climate finance architecture	UNFCCC secretariat
	11:15 – 11:35	Coffee Break	
	11:35 – 12:00	Accessing resources from the Adaptation Fund - Modalities of access and, key points of the Operational Policies and guidelines	AFB secretariat
	12:00 – 12:15	Open discussion	
	12:15 – 13:15	Role and responsibilities of NIE in the implementation of projects funded by the AF Objective: Promote an in-depth understanding on the functions performed by the Designated Authority and National Implementing Entity, with the aim of helping countries identify the appropriate entities	
	12:15 – 12:25	Role of Designated Authority (DA) and guidelines for selecting DA	AFB secretariat
	12:25 – 12:45	Role of Implementing Entities and guidelines for identifying appropriate National Implementing Entity	AFB secretariat
	12:45 – 13:00	Open discussions	
	13:00 – 14:00	Lunch	
	14:00 – 17:30	Accreditation process for National Implementing Entities (NIEs) including key elements of the Fiduciary Standard Objective: Promote an in-depth understanding of the fiduciary standards and enable participants to do a comprehensive job of completing the accreditation application for National Implementing Entities	
	14:00 – 14:15	Overview of accreditation process for NIEs	AFB secretariat
	14:15 – 15:30	Fiduciary Standard for Financial Management and Integrity (discussions are built into the workshop material)	Expert member, Accreditation Panel
	15:30 – 15:50	Coffee Break	
	15:50 – 17:20	Fiduciary Standard for Institutional Capacity (discussions are built into the workshop	Expert member, Accreditation

		material)	Panel
	17:20 – 17:30	Summary of presentation and outline for next day	
Day 2	09:30 – 09:40	Review of presentations of 1 st day	
	09:40 – 10:30	Accreditation process for National Implementing Entities NIEs including key elements of the Fiduciary Standard Continued from previous day Objective: Promote an in-depth understanding of the fiduciary standards and enable participants to do a comprehensive job of completing the accreditation application for National Implementing Entities	
	09:40 – 10:10	Fiduciary Standard for Transparency self-investigative powers and anti corruption measures (discussions are built into the workshop material)	Expert member, Accreditation Panel
	10:10 – 10:30	Summary of the fiduciary standards and open discussions	Expert member, Accreditation Panel
	10:30 – 11:30	Successful National Implementing Entity accreditation and hands on examples Objective: Enable participants to do a comprehensive job of completing the accreditation application by demonstrating how it is done.	
	10:30 - 10:50	Senegal - presentation by Centre de Suivi Ecologique	
	10:50 – 11:20	Example of filling of the Accreditation Application Form	Expert member, Accreditation Panel
	11:20 – 11:30	Open discussions	
	11:30 – 11:50	Coffee Break	
	11:50 – 12:20	Creating a road map to access resources from Adaptation Fund through direct access Objective: Enable participants, particularly National Implementing Entity candidates, to better comprehend the project cycle and the process of project design	
	11:50 – 12:10	Presentation of project cycle and the project approval process	AFB secretariat
	12:10 – 12:20	Open discussions	
	12:20 – 13:15	The Accreditation Toolkit Objective: Provide inputs to the participants to enable them to understand and use the Accreditation Toolkit to complete the Accreditation Application Form	AFB secretariat Expert member, Accreditation Panel
	12:20 – 12:50	Understanding the Accreditation Toolkit and its use	
	12:50 – 13:15	Open house	
	13:15 – 14:15	Lunch	
	14:15 – 15:15	Small group sessions and consultations on preparation of accreditation forms and project documents	Expert member, Accreditation Panel
	15:15 – 15:35	Coffee Break	
	15:35 – 17:00	Small group sessions and consultations on preparation of accreditation forms and project documents	Expert member, Accreditation Panel
	17:00 - 17:30	Summary and concluding remarks	