



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/B.13/6
April 18, 2011

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

Thirteenth Meeting
Bonn, March 17 to 18, 2011

REPORT OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

Introduction

1. The thirteenth meeting of the Board of the Adaptation Fund of the Kyoto Protocol was held at the 'Langer Eugen' UN Campus, in Bonn, from March 17 to 18, 2011, back-to-back with the fourth meetings of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) and the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) of the Adaptation Fund Board. The meeting was convened pursuant to Decision 1/CMP.3 adopted at the third Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP).

2. The full list of the members and alternate members, nominated by their respective groups and elected pursuant to Decisions 1/CMP.3 and 1/CMP.4, and participating at the meeting, is attached as Annex I to the present report. A list of all registered observers present at the meeting can be found on the Adaptation Fund website at <http://www.adaptation-fund.org/13thAFB>.

3. The meeting was broadcast live through a link on the websites of the Adaptation Fund and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). The UNCCD secretariat had provided logistical and administrative support for the hosting of the meeting.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the meeting

4. The meeting was opened at 11.25 a.m. on Thursday, 17 March 2011, by the outgoing Chair, Mr. Farrukh Iqbal Khan (Pakistan, Non-Annex I Parties), who greeted the members and alternates of the Adaptation Fund Board, and welcomed all the participants at the thirteenth meeting of the Board.

Agenda Item 2: Transition of the Chair and the Vice-Chair

5. At its twelfth meeting, the Board of the Adaptation Fund had, in Decision 12/36, endorsed the nominations of Ms. Ana Fornells de Frutos (Spain, Annex I Parties) as Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board, and Mr. Luis Santos (Uruguay, Latin American and Caribbean

Countries) as Vice-Chair of the Board, for a term beginning in March 2011 and ending in March 2012. Following the opening of the meeting, the outgoing Chair invited Ms. Fornells de Frutos to chair the meeting.

The incoming Chair thanked Mr. Khan for all his efforts and success over the previous year in positioning the Adaptation Fund as a fully operational financial institution and pledged to further its work. She attributed the recognition that the Board's work has received to the collective efforts of all involved in the work of the Adaptation Fund, including former chairs, members, alternates, the Secretariat and the Trustee. She also said that the Adaptation Fund Board needs to further communicate and disseminate the work of the Adaptation Fund to obtain the recognition and support of potential contributors, and continue to raise awareness on the direct access modality.

6. The incoming Vice-Chair also thanked the outgoing Chair and promised his support to both the incoming Chair and the Board as a whole.

Agenda Item 3: Organizational matters

(a) Adoption of the agenda

7. The Board considered the provisional agenda contained in document AFB/B.13/1, as well as the provisional annotated agenda contained in document AFB/B.13/2, and the provisional timetable attached to it. The Board also agreed to consider the following issues under agenda item 14, "Other matters": the move to a paperless system for meeting documents; participation in *in the Transitional Committee of the Green Climate Fund*; the definition of conflicts of interest; a minute of silence for Japan and all those who had perished in catastrophes and calamities and had been victims of violence since the start of the present year; and a strategic discussion on National Implementing Entities (NIEs), as well as the role of Multinational Implementing Entities (MIEs) in building the capacities of NIEs.

8. The Board adopted the agenda, as orally amended, and as contained in Annex II to the present report, and the provisional timetable, as proposed by the Chair.

(b) Organization of work

9. The Board adopted the organization of work proposed by the Chair.

(c) Introduction of new members and declarations of conflict of interest

10. The Chair introduced Ms. Angela Churie-Kallhauge (Sweden, Western European and Others Group), as a new member and Mr. Yutaka Matsuzawa (Japan, Annex I Parties), as a new alternate of the Board. She said that they would soon be asked to sign the Oath of Service which, she reminded the Board, was an important document that outlined the privileges and obligations of the members and alternates.

11. The Oath of Service was distributed to the new member and alternate, who signed the Oath documents and submitted them to the secretariat. After this, all the alternates and members of the Board were asked to declare any conflicts of interest with the items on the agenda for the meeting. The following members and alternates declared conflicts of interest:

- (a) Mr. Shawkat Ali Mirza (Bangladesh, Least-Developed Countries);

- (b) Mr. Luis Santos (Uruguay, Latin American and Caribbean Countries); and
- (c) Mr. Richard Muyungi (United Republic of Tanzania, Least-Developed Countries).

Agenda Item 4: Report on intersessional activities of the outgoing Chair

12. The outgoing Chair reported on his activities during the previous year and during the intersessional period, which are more fully described in Annex III to the present report.
13. The Board took note of the report by the outgoing Chair.

Agenda Item 5: Report on the activities of the secretariat

14. The Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat reported on the activities of the secretariat during the intersessional period, and which are more fully described in document AFB/B.13/3. In her presentation she said that the secretariat had continued to screen applications for accreditation and that it had received three new requests for accreditation as an NIE and one for accreditation as an MIE; and that two new applications for accreditation as an NIE and one for accreditation as an MIE had been sent to the Accreditation Panel (AP) for review. Since the inception of the accreditation process the secretariat had screened 14 applications from non-Annex I Parties, two from regional organizations and 10 from multilateral organizations and development banks. Of those, 11 applications from non-Annex I parties and 9 from multilateral organizations and development banks had been reviewed by the AP.

15. She also said that the secretariat had been working closely with the UNFCCC secretariat and the Accreditation Panel in the organization of the workshops that had been mandated pursuant to decision 5.CMP/6. The Board was also informed that the accreditation toolkit was ready and that the project and programme database had been finalized and the secretariat had started to use it to input project and programme proposals. She also reiterated that the secretariat's work programme to raise awareness on NIE accreditation had been completed. She further informed the Board that the secretariat of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) had offered the Adaptation Fund Board the opportunity to make a presentation on the accreditation of NIEs at some of the extended constituency workshops that it was organizing during 2011; following which a list of dates for the extended constituency workshops was circulated for the consideration of the Board.

16. The Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat was asked whether the use of additional help from the staff of the GEF for the screening process had led to a duplication of efforts and a delay in the review process. The Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat explained that the secretariat relied on cross-support from the GEF to provide additional expertise beyond that held by the secretariat when undertaking reviews. She also said that, as the reviews were undertaken by the staff of the secretariat and by the experts from the GEF simultaneously, that additional support did not create any delays during the review process.

17. Following a request for clarification as to the nature of the extended constituency workshops, and the process of their organization, the Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat explained that the workshops had been organized by the GEF and not by the secretariat of the Adaptation Fund Board, so the costs associated with attending those meetings for raising awareness were very low. However, it was not possible for the secretariat to change the dates or the venues of the meetings, or decide the constituencies attending the meetings.

She also said that funds remained in the current budget for the promotion of NIEs and that would enable participation in two or three workshops during the present fiscal year, but there was a need to allow the secretariat certain flexibility to decide what meeting to attend.

18. One member wished to see reflected in the report his unease with such participation in meetings organized by GEF that were overlapping with meetings under the UNFCCC process because some relevant participants may not be able to attend those workshops. He was of the opinion that there was a risk that the Board would fail to meet its objectives to reach out broadly to potential NIEs. However, the Board recognized that it was invited to participate in the workshops and fulfillment of its objectives to promote outreach cannot be determined by the internal planning of an organization that is extending its activities for use of the Board.

19. One Board member requested that the secretariat provide, for the purpose of ease of reference by the Board, with a compendium of all the decisions taken by the Board. The PPRC Chair informed that a similar request had been made by the PPRC regarding decisions relevant to the work of the PPRC, and the secretariat was requested to provide it for the next meeting of the PPRC.

20. The Board took note of the presentation on the activities of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat.

21. Following consideration of the proposal by the secretariat, the Board decided to:

- (a) Accept with thanks the invitation of the GEF secretariat to participate in its Extended Constituency workshops on the understanding that:
 - (i) One representative of the secretariat would attend up to three workshops to disseminate information on the accreditation process as well as other relevant information, including information on the project cycle;
 - (ii) The participation of the secretariat in the workshops would be funded under its approved FY 2011 budget to support awareness raising activities on the accreditation of National Implementing Entities;
 - (iii) The secretariat estimated that it had the resources to participate in two workshops, although it could participate in an additional third workshop if time and resources permitted; and
 - (iv) The secretariat had confirmed that it would participate in one workshop per region;
 - (v) The secretariat had the flexibility to adjust its participation in the workshops given that the schedule of the workshops had not yet been finalized.

(Decision B.13/1)

Agenda Item 6: Report of the fifth meeting of the Accreditation Panel

22. Mr. Santiago Reyna (Argentina, Latin American and Caribbean Countries), Chair of the Accreditation Panel, introduced the report of the fifth meeting of the Accreditation Panel, which is more fully described in document AFB/B.13/4. In his presentation Mr. Reyna said that the

Panel had received two new applications for accreditation as an NIE and one for accreditation as an MIE. The panel had also reviewed the results of a field visit made to one applicant country as well as three other NIE applications that had been previously reviewed but had required additional information before the Panel could make a recommendation to the Board. He also explained that for the purposes of confidentiality the Accreditation Panel had used a numbering system to report of the status of each implementing entity's application.

23. Following the presentation by Mr. Reyna, several members said that they would require additional information on the process of the evaluation of the candidates and, given the sensitivity of the information being discussed, that part of the meeting should be closed.

24. The Chair closed the meeting in order to discuss the applications for accreditation. Those members and alternate with conflicts of interest also left the meeting room. Following the closed session the Chair said that those proposed NIEs which had not been recommended for accreditation would be informed of the reasons for that decision and provided with further details if requested by the Accreditation Panel. She also said that the strategic discussion on the promotion of NIEs, which had commenced during the closed meeting, would be continued under the agenda item 14, 'Other matters'.

Non-accreditation of applicant NIE 1

25. The Board, having considered the conclusions drawn by the Accreditation Panel on applicant NIE 1 and following the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, decided that it is not in a position to accredit the applicant. The Board further instructed the secretariat to communicate the conclusions as contained in Annex IV to the present report to the applicant and to inform the applicant that further information from the Accreditation Panel can be made available upon request.

(Decision B.13/2)

Non-accreditation of NIE 2

26. The Board, having considered the conclusions drawn by the Accreditation Panel on applicant NIE 2 and following the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, decided that it is not in a position to accredit the applicant. The Board further instructed the secretariat to communicate the conclusions as contained in Annex V to the present report to the applicant and to inform the applicant that further information from the Accreditation Panel can be made available upon request.

(Decision B.13/3)

Accreditation Panel observations of applicant NIE 3

27. The Board decided to:

- (a) Authorize the Accreditation Panel to conduct a field visit to the applicant; and
- (b) Approve an amendment to the Adaptation Fund Board and secretariat fiscal year 2011 budget, adding the amount of US \$22,000 for the Accreditation Panel to conduct the field visit.

(Decision B.13/4)*Accreditation Panel observations of applicant NIE 4*

28. The Board decided to:

- (a) Authorize the Accreditation Panel to conduct a field visit to the applicant, should the Panel conclude that, upon review of the additional documentation submitted, applicant NIE 4 is a reasonable candidate for accreditation; and
- (b) Approve an amendment to the Adaptation Fund Board and secretariat fiscal year 2011 budget, adding the amount of US \$22,000 for the Accreditation Panel to conduct the field visit.

(Decision B.13/5)*Accreditation Panel observations of applicant MIE*

29. The Board decided to allow the Accreditation Panel to submit a recommendation on the accreditation of the MIE intersessionally, should the Panel conclude that the assessment of the additional documentation reviewed lead it to make such a positive recommendation.

(Decision B.13/6)*Clarification of the fiduciary standards and supporting documentation*

30. The Board took note of the *Clarification of the fiduciary standards and supporting documentation* in the revised accreditation application template, as contained in Annex VI to the present report, and decided to approve its use.

(Decision B.13/7)*Regional workshops on accreditation of NIEs mandated by CMP 6*

31. The Chair of the Accreditation Panel introduced the recommendations submitted by the Accreditation Panel, contained in Annex III to document AFB/B.13/4.

32. The Board also heard a presentation by a representative of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) on the modalities for holding regional accreditation workshops, as had been mandated by decision 5/CMP.6. By that decision the UNFCCC secretariat had been given the mandate to organize three regional or subregional workshops; with a fourth workshop if sufficient resources were available. He said that the estimated cost of holding each workshop was US \$420,000 and that the total cost of holding three workshops would be US \$1.26 million or US \$1.68 million for four workshops. The cost of the workshops was calculated following the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel on the level of participation and length of the workshops. A letter had been sent out to potential donors and it was proposed to hold two workshops during 2011 and a further one or two workshops during 2012. He said that the UNFCCC secretariat would work together with the secretariat of the Adaptation Fund Board to plan the agenda for the workshops and that the recommendation

from the Accreditation Panel approved by the Adaptation Fund Board would be incorporated into the planning process.

33. The Chair said that the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel was to hold the first workshop in the Asian and Eastern European region, the second in Latin American and Caribbean region during 2011; and during 2012 a third workshop would take place in Africa with the possibility of a fourth workshop in the Pacific region, if resources were available.

34. Mr. Matsuzawa (Japan, Annex I Parties) said that the Government of Japan would be prepared to provide funding for a workshop in Africa in preparation for the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. To that end he suggested that timetable for the workshops be flexibly implemented to allow for a workshop in Africa during 2011.

35. Following a discussion of the desirability of holding three workshops during 2011, the weighting given by the Accreditation Panel to the regions when prioritizing the regions concerned, the need to firm-up the scheduling of a fourth workshop for the Pacific region, the offer by the Government of Japan to fund a regional workshop in Africa during 2011, the resources available to the UNFCCC secretariat for organizing more than two workshops per year, as well as the potential participants in the workshops and the objectives of the workshops, the Board decided to:

- (a) Adopt, with the exception of the section on location and scheduling of the workshops, the input from the Accreditation Panel as contained in Annex III of document AFB/B.13/4;
- (b) Prioritize a regional workshop on accreditation in Africa with a regional workshop in Latin America as the second priority for the year 2011;
- (c) Prioritize a regional workshop in Eastern Europe and Asia for the year 2012, on the understanding that an additional workshop would also be held in the Pacific region during 2012 if funds and resources permitted; and
- (d) Create a working group to prepare guidance and other documents for the regional workshops by April 2011. The following were named by the Chair to work with herself in preparing the documents for intersessional adoption by the Board:
 - (i) Ms. Kate Binns (United Kingdom, Annex I Parties);
 - (ii) Mr. Santiago Reyna (Argentina, Latin America and Others Group);
 - (iii) Mr. Anton Hilber (Switzerland, Western European and Others Group);
 - (iv) Mr. Jeffery Spooner (Jamaica, Latin American and Caribbean); and
 - (v) Mr. Cheikh Ndiaye Sylla (Senegal, Africa).

(Decision B.13/8)

Conditional accreditation

36. The Chair of the Accreditation Panel said that the Panel had taken note of the increasing difficulty to accredit NIEs and had therefore considered the use of conditional accreditation to facilitate that process. Although conditional accreditation is contained within the Terms of Reference of the Accreditation Panel, the issue had been brought before the Board as it raised concerns about the additional impact it would have on the secretariat and its resources, especially if the conditional accreditation entailed additional reporting requirements. The proposal by the AP was that if conditional accreditation was applied, it could be granted for the period of five years, but at any time during this period the IE can provide additional information that allows the deletion of the conditionality.

37. While some considered the proposal by the Accreditation Panel a practical solution, others said that care needed to be taken to insure that no weakness was introduced into the accreditation process, as the proposal might create insecurity for project implementation if the conditional accreditation of an implementing entity were to be revoked. It would be important for the Accreditation Panel to consider the ongoing work on results-based management, as well as the need for internal auditing, when considering conditional accreditation. However, others expressed their doubts and were also unsure of the suggestion to use MIEs as a support system for part of project cycle of an NIE or to limit the financial size of a project that an NIE would be allowed to handle.

38. Following the discussion the Board decided to:

- (a) Request the Accreditation 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. The study should 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). Any conditional accreditation should also ensure that the agreed fiduciary standards are not compromised; and
- (b) Consider the study prepared by the Accreditation Panel at its 14th meeting.

(Decision B.13/9)

Agenda Item 7: Report of the fourth meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC)

39. The Chair of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), Mr. Hans Olav Ibrek (Norway, Western European and Others Group) introduced document AFB/PPRC.3/L.2, which contained the fourth report of the PPRC. In his presentation he said the report represented a response to the requests that had been made for more transparency in the Committee's decision making process. While the committee's meeting would continue to be closed, its report would provide as much detail as possible on the committee's deliberations. Two strategic issues had been discussed by the PPRC: programme review criteria and the definition of concrete adaptation projects. He said that the committee had come to the conclusion that a number of the projects being considered could be considered programmes and that it had been difficult for the proponents and the Committee to distinguish between them. He said that the issue would have to be addressed during the forthcoming review of the operational policies and guidelines.

40. The Chair of the PPRC also said that the Committee had addressed the definition of concrete adaptation projects/programmes and noted that it would be setting a precedent once it had come to a conclusion on that issue. He also explained that if the Board decided to approve all the fully-developed proposals submitted by MIEs at the present meeting the cumulative funding decision would amount to US \$44 million which would be well below the 50 per cent limit set by the Board in Decision B.12/9.

Proposal from a National Implementing Entity

Uruguay: Building Resilience to Climate Change and Variability in Vulnerable Smallholders (ANII) (URY/NIE/Agri/2011/1, US\$7,350,000)

41. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Projects and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Approve the Project Formulation Grant Request in the amount of US\$30,000;
- (b) Endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Agencia Nacional de Investigación e Innovación (ANII) to the request made during the technical review of the proposal;
- (c) Request that the secretariat transmit to the ANII the following observations made by the members of the Project and Programmes Review Committee (PPRC) on the project when discussing it at its fourth meeting:
 - (i) The fully-developed proposal should expand on the information provided in the project, particularly on Part III of the proposal, and on the ecosystem based adaptation approach that it is promoting;
 - (ii) The fully-developed proposal should include the most recent data collected through the project of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations on livestock vulnerability;
 - (iii) The fully-developed proposal should present technology investment options focusing more on climate-proofing the extensive livestock system: the increase in competitiveness should be an added value of the project and not its objective;
 - (iv) The fully-developed proposal should provide an elaborated risk/mitigation table;
 - (v) The fully-developed proposal should quantify the expected results in more detail;
 - (vi) In the fully-developed proposal, the framework table should be brought better in line with the results stated in the text, and in particular result 1 of the framework table which is not in line with the objectives of project component 1;
 - (vii) The fully-developed proposal should provide a budget on the implementing entity management fee use; an explanation and a breakdown of all administrative costs associated with the project, including the execution costs; as well as a disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones;

- (viii) The fully-developed proposal should provide information on the scenarios for climate change in the areas being addressed by the project;
 - (ix) The fully-developed proposal should provide a strategy for scaling-up the project; and
 - (x) The fully-developed proposal should explain how the project would reduce vulnerability to climate change.
- (d) Request that ANII transmit the observations referred to in paragraph (c) above to the Government of Uruguay; and
- (e) Encourage the Government of Uruguay to submit through the ANII a fully-developed project proposal that would address the observations made under paragraph (c).

(Decision B.13/10)

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities

Ecuador: Enhancing resilience of communities to the adverse effects of climate change on food security, in Pichincha Province and the Jubones River Basin (WFP) (ECU/MIE/Food/2010/1, US\$7,449,468)

42. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Projects and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Approve the project with the budget of US\$7,449,468, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the World Food Programme (WFP) to the request made during the technical review of the proposal; and;
- (b) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with the WFP as the Multilateral Implementing Entity for the project.

(Decision B.13/11)

Eritrea: Climate change adaptation programme in water and agriculture in Anseba Region, Eritrea (UNDP) (ERI/MIE/Rural/2010/2, US\$6,520,850)

43. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Projects and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Approve the project, with the budget of US\$6,520,850, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the request made during the technical review of the proposal; and
- (b) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UNDP as the Multilateral Implementing Entity for the project.

(Decision B.13/12)

Solomon Islands: Enhancing resilience of communities in Solomon Islands to the adverse effects of climate change in agriculture and food security (UNDP) (SLB/MIE/Food/2010/1, US\$5,533,500)

44. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Projects and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Approve the project, with a budget of US\$5,533,500, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the request made during the technical review of the proposal; and
- (b) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UNDP as the Multilateral Implementing Entity.

(Decision B.13/13)

Tanzania (United Republic of): Implementation of concrete adaptation measures to reduce vulnerability of livelihood and economy of coastal and lakeshore communities in Tanzania (UNEP) (TZA/MIE/Coastal/2010/3, US\$9,814,517)

45. Several members observed that it was the second time that the project was not being recommended for approval and asked for a clarification as to whether the concerns raised at the twelfth meeting had been transmitted to the proponent of the project, and whether the concerns could be addressed during project implementation.

46. The secretariat explained that the concerns expressed by the PPRC at its third meeting had been transmitted to the proponent and that the proponent had submitted a revised proposal that had also raised new concerns. The Chair of the PPRC also said that the concerns discussed were such that they could not be addressed during the implementation of the project, although one member of the PPRC pointed out that the PPRC had not discussed that issue per se.

47. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Projects and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Not to approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the additional information provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in response to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) Request that the secretariat transmit to UNEP the following observations made by the members of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) on the project when discussing it at its fourth meeting;
 - (i) The proposal should clarify what the expected outcome of the project is, given the multiple activities therein, including the actual quantified outputs that contribute to the outcome, the adaptation challenges (baseline) they are designed to overcome, and their contribution to the project level objective. This is equally important for the ecosystem-based adaptation outcomes, for which the geographic scope and distribution are key, and for the technical works for which the technical design description is key;

- (ii) The proposal should explain the synergies and linkages between the activities within the project, including those between the ecosystem-based activities and the hard infrastructure activities;
 - (iii) The proposal should clearly explain the coordination with other activities; and
 - (iv) The proposal should explain how comprehensive stakeholder community consultations have been in coverage and participation, including vulnerable groups, and how such participation is ensured during the life of the project.
- (c) Further request that UNEP transmit the observations referred to under paragraph (b) above to the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, on the understanding that the proposal could be reformulated; and
- (d) Encourage the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania to resubmit the proposal taking into account the observations made by the members of the PPRC on the proposal when discussing it at its fourth meeting.

(Decision B.13/14)

Project and Programme pipeline management

48. One member noted that it was unclear whether the funding of projects being proposed was set aside for them pending their approval or whether the funding was awarded on a “first-come, first-served” basis once the projects had been approved.

49. The representative of trustee said that it had discussed with the secretariat the modalities for responding to the endorsement of project concepts and that it currently reported on the impact of funding decisions once those decisions had been taken by the Board.

50. The Chair proposed that the secretariat and the trustee should develop a series of options for consideration by the Ethics and Finance Committee at its fifth meeting.

51. Following the discussion, the Board decided to:

- (a) Request the trustee and the secretariat to develop options for the presentation of the project and programme pipeline; and
- (b) Submit those options for the consideration of the Ethics and Finance Committee at its fifth meeting.

(Decision B.13/15)

Cross-cutting issues

52. The Chair of the PPRC also said that during its deliberations the PPRC had addressed a number of cross-cutting issues: the request for additional clarifications when projects had been reformulated, especially when they had addressed issues that had not been raised initially; the methods used by the secretariat when communicating the decisions of PPRC to the proponents; and the need for a compilation of the relevant decisions of the Board, to help the members of the PPRC in their deliberations. He said that the PPRC had requested the secretariat to make

such a compilation of the relevant decisions and informed the Board that it would be important that provision be made to ensure that the Chair and Vice-Chair of the PPRC would be able to be involved in the improvement of the technical review criteria and the project cycle to facilitate the review of the operational policies and guidelines, including by carrying out a single visit to the offices of the secretariat, if they considered that necessary. The projected financial cost of such a visit was US \$7,000.

53. Following the discussion, the Board decided to:

- (a) Authorize the Chair and Vice-Chair of the PPRC to be involved in the improvement of the technical review criteria and the project cycle to facilitate the review of the operational policies and guidelines, and to carry out a single visit to the offices of the secretariat, if they considered that necessary; and
- (b) Approve an allocation of US \$7,000 in the Adaptation Fund Board and secretariat fiscal year 2011 budget, from Travel Component, budget line for Board Meetings, to cover the expenses related to the Vice-Chair visit..

(Decision B.13/16)

54. A list of the Board approved funding for the project and programme concepts, fully-developed projects and fully-developed programmes approved by the Board at its present meeting, as well as amendments made to the budget for the current fiscal year, is contained in Annex VII to the present report.

Agenda Item 8: Report of the fourth meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC)

55. The Chair of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), Mr. Mirza Shawkat Ali (Bangladesh, Least-Developed Countries), introduced document AFB/EFC.4/L.1, which contained the fourth report of the EFC. He thanked the members of the committee for their hard work and said that the main topics addressed had been: evaluation issues, and the initial funding priorities; as well as a desk study on execution costs; the implementation of the code of conduct; results-based management; the review of the operational policies and guidelines; the consideration of expressions of interest to undertake the performance study of the secretariat and trustee; the status of resources of the Adaptation Trust Fund; the Administrative Budget of the Board, and secretariat and trustee; and the facilitation of private donations. He submitted the report of the EFC to the Board for its consideration.

Desk study on execution costs

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

- (a) Include in the Project/Programme monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework a break-down of how implementing entity (IE) fees will be utilized in the supervision of the M&E function;
- (b) Set a cap of 9.5% of the project budget for execution costs and to require a Board approval if a project requires an additional budget beyond that limit;

- (c) Endorse the standardized template table developed for project execution costs as contained in the Annex to document AFB/EFC.4/7 and to circulate it to IEs for their inputs before final approval at the fourteenth meeting of the Board and inclusion in the project template. The standardized template should be used as guidance in breaking down project execution costs; and
- (d) Request IEs to provide budget notes along with a detailed budget for project components.

(Decision B.13/17)

Implementation of the code of conduct

57. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Board decided that agenda items in which multilateral implementing entities might have an interest may be closed for discussion whenever the Board Chair deems it appropriate.

(Decision B.13/18)

Guidelines for Project/Programme Final Evaluations

58. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Board decided to:

- (a) Endorse the *Guidelines for Project/Programme Final Evaluations*, as contained in the annex to document AFB/EFC.4/6; and
- (b) Request the secretariat and the GEF Evaluation Office to incorporate the comments received from the Board members by April 30, 2011, in a final version which would be presented to the Board at its fourteenth meeting.

(Decision B.13/19)

Evaluation Framework

59. Having considered the *Evaluation Framework*, and pursuant to the recommendation of the EFC, the Board decided to:

- (a) Endorse the evaluation framework;
- (b) Request that a revised version be presented to the Board at its fourteenth Meeting, incorporating the comments provided at the fourth meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), as well as any additional comments received from the board members by April 30, 2011;
- (c) That:
 - (i) In the revised versions, making a mid-term evaluation mandatory for projects that have a longer time-frame, or are above a certain dollar amount, should be considered. That revised version should also include a clear delimitation between Mid-Term Evaluations and Mid-Term Reviews;

- (ii) An overall evaluation of the Fund should be conducted, but given that only one project is currently under implementation, the date of such an evaluation would be discussed during the seventh meeting of the EFC;
 - (iii) The new version of the report should clearly lay out that final evaluations should be disclosed publically, taking into account sensitive issues;
 - (iv) The inclusion of civil society is an international best practice in evaluations and should be kept as currently presented in the *Evaluation Framework* and the *Guidelines for Project/Programme Final Evaluations*, mentioned in decision AFB.13/18 above; encouraging all evaluations to have full consultation with all relevant stakeholders; and
- (d) Request the GEF Evaluation Office to continue to provide support to the secretariat regarding evaluation matters; and that the secretariat and the GEF Evaluation Office should explore different options on who would be responsible for implementing the evaluation framework. That should include the option to request the Evaluation Office to fulfill that role in the future, on a temporary basis, and those options should be detailed in the next version of the Evaluation Framework.

(Decision B.13/20)

Review of the operational policies and guidelines

60. The Chair of the PPRC said that the PPRC had already identified a number of issues that should be taken up when the operational policies and guidelines were reviewed and to that end it would be important to coordinate the work of the two committees. He stressed that it was important to take the time to have a comprehensive review of those policies and guidelines.

61. Following the intervention by the Chair of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), the Board decided to:

- (a) Approve the proposed amendments to the operational policies and guidelines contained in the annex to document AFB/EFC.4/9, except for the deletion of the word “ministries” in footnote 12 of that annex, taking into account the comments made by the members of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) at its fourth meeting. The secretariat will incorporate the agreed text into the draft revised operational policies and guidelines for the consideration of the Board at its fourteenth meeting;
- (b) Establish an ad-hoc committee consisting of two members from the PPRC and the EFC, as well as either the Chair or the Vice-Chair of the Accreditation Panel and two other members at large, to consider the issues outlined in sections II b) and c) of document AFB/EFC.4/9, as well as any other issue that may be deemed relevant, including in looking at the issue of audit and notification. The ad-hoc committee, supported by the secretariat, should produce proposals for amending the operational policies and guidelines addressing the issues identified above.
- (c) Name the following members and alternate members to the ad hoc committee:
 - (i) Ms. Kate Binns, Vice-Chair of the Accreditation Panel;

- (ii) Mr. Hans Olav Ibrekk, Chair of the PPRC;
 - (iii) Mr. Mirza Shawkat Ali, Chair of the EFC
 - (iv) Mr. Amjad Abdulla (Maldives, Small-Island Developing States)
- and
- (v) Mr. Zaheer Fakir (South Africa, Africa).
- (d) Request the secretariat to present a consolidated draft of the revised operational policies and guidelines to the fifth meeting of the EFC, incorporating any decision taken at the present Board meeting that may require further amendments.

(Decision B.13/21)

Results based management

62. Some of the Board members expressed concern at the inclusion of “Annex II: Project selection process” – which contains a list of countries ranked, among other indicators, according to an Environmental Benefit indicator – in document AFB/EFC4/3, but it was explained that the examples given had been simply indicative. The Chair of the PPRC also said that there was a need to incorporate results-based management (RBM) within the work of the PPRC; another Board member asked for a clarification of what work the UNFCCC was doing on indicators. Mr. Claudio Volonte, Chief Evaluation Officer of the GEF referred to the work presented by UNFCCC/SBSTA at its 32nd session on a synthesis report on efforts undertaken to monitor and evaluate the implementation of adaptation projects, policies and programmes. There was consensus that more work and research should be done before making any decisions to incorporate impact level indicators into the Fund’s approved results framework.

63. Following the discussion, the Chair asked Mr. Farrukh Iqbal Khan (Pakistan, Non-Annex I Parties), Mr. Anton Hilber (Switzerland, Western European and Others Group), Mr. Amjad Abdulla (Maldives, Small-Island Developing States), Mr. Richard Muyungi (United Republic of Tanzania, Least-Developed Countries) and Ms. Angela Churie-Kallhauge (Sweden, Western European and Others Group) to prepare a revised recommendation for the consideration of the Board.

64. Mr. Mirza Shawkat Ali, Chair of the EFC reported that the members of the group had been unable to prepare a revised recommendation.

65. The Board decided to continue discussion on the issue of results-based management in the context of the revision of the operational policies and guidelines at its fourteenth meeting.

(Decision B.13/22)

Initial funding priorities

66. It was noted that the issue had been under consideration by the Board since its inception and that some progress had been made in considering the initial funding priorities, including considering the issue of vulnerability of certain groups to climate change. However, there was

still disagreement on the desirability of establishing, as a temporary measure, variable caps which took into consideration the specific circumstances of certain groups of countries. A Board member also expressed his concern that the establishment of a cap could have negative ramifications for the establishment of NIEs, where the funding cap may serve as a disincentive for countries that have already utilized the MIE modality to access funding. It was also observed that the Board had not yet been asked to consider regional programmes and consequently it was unclear how the cap was to apply to those countries that also participated in a regional programme.

67. Following the discussion, the Board decided, as temporary measure to:

- (a) Approve a cap of US \$10 million for each country funded for support by the Adaptation Fund; and
- (b) Request the secretariat to present a proposal to the Ethics and Finance Committee on how regional projects or programmes would be considered within the cap of US \$10 million per country funded for support.

(Decision B.13/23)

Performance study on the secretariat and trustee: consideration of expressions of interest to undertake the performance study

68. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Board decided to:

- (a) Approve US\$50,000 to cover the costs of the study;
- (b) Approve the terms of reference contained in Annex VIII to the present report that should be posted on the AF and UNFCCC website specifying the ceiling approved for undertaking the performance study; and
- (c) Name the following members to the ad hoc committee to evaluate the expressions of interest and develop a short-list of candidates to be interviewed:
 - (i) Ms. Ana Fornells de Frutos (Spain, Annex I Parties), Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board;
 - (ii) Mr. Anton Hilber (Switzerland, Western European and Others Group);
 - (iii) Mr. Zaheer Fakir (South Africa, Africa); and
 - (iv) Mr. Luis Santos (Uruguay, Latin American and Caribbean Countries).

(Decision B.13/24)

Administrative budgets of the Board and the secretariat, and the trustee

69. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Board decided to:

- (a) Note the additional information provided by the trustee on the administrative budgets of the Board and secretariat for the fiscal year 2011 as presented by the secretariat and trustee; and
- (b) Approve an estimated budget of US\$258,500 for the trustee for the balance of the 2011 fiscal year (April 1 to June 30, 2011), comprising US\$168,000 for CER monetization services and US\$90,500 for all other trustee services.

(Decision B.13/25)

Facilitating private donations

70. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Board decided to request the trustee to proceed with implementing a procedure to facilitate private donations by credit or debit card, including selecting payment service provider in accordance with the trustee's policies and procedures; and that the trustee work with the secretariat to implement that option.

(Decision B.13/26)

Agenda Item 9: Issues remaining from the twelfth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board

Vulnerability

71. On the proposal of the Chair, the Board decided to defer further consideration of the issue of vulnerability until the Conference of the Parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate change, or some other body, had reported some progress on the definition of vulnerability.

(Decision B.13/27)

Accreditation of non-invited multilateral institutions

72. During the closed meeting the Board also decided to continue its discussion of the issue of the accreditation of non-invited multilateral institutions at its sixteenth meeting.

(Decision B.13/28)

Agenda Item 10: Report on the implementation of the communications strategy

73. The Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat presented the report on the implementation of the communications strategy which had been developed by a consultant, and which is more fully described in document AFB/B.13/5.

74. In the discussion that followed, it was observed that in spite of some difficulties encountered during the process of implementation, interaction with the consultant helped the outgoing Chair and the secretariat better understand the difficulties involved in communicating the message of adaptation to those who were unfamiliar with the process of climate change negotiations. The consultant had produced a number of useful messages and a series of

thematic fact sheets which were attached as an annex to the document. The key message involved how best for the Adaptation Fund Board to communicate with the world at large, and a number of suggestions were made, including the development of a newsletter or the circulation of the fact sheets developed by the consultant and the secretariat. It was also suggested that the Board might wish to strengthen the secretariat by creating the position of communications officer.

75. The Board took note of the presentation by the Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat and decided to:

- (a) Request the Board members and the secretariat to use the messages developed in the communication strategy when delivering presentations on the Adaptation Fund and to disseminate the fact sheets contained in the annex to document AFB/B.13/5;
- (b) Request the secretariat to integrate those messages into the website of the Adaptation Fund;
- (c) Request the secretariat to explore the use of innovative communications tools, taking into account inter alia such tools as twitter and facebook, in its efforts to disseminate the messages of the Adaptation Fund Board;
- (d) Request the secretariat and Board members to participate in the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), as well as in the meetings of its subsidiary bodies, insofar as possible;
- (e) Request the UNFCCC secretariat to include the calendar of the Adaptation Fund Board within its website; and
- (f) Consider the viability of implementing the options outlined above and take appropriate measures to implement its communication strategy.

(Decision B.13/29)

Agenda Item 11: Financial Issues

CER Monetization

76. The Board heard an update by the trustee on the CER monetization programme as well as recent events in the carbon markets, including the impacts of the recent thefts of European Union Allowances (EUAs) from several national registries which had precipitated the temporary closure of the BlueNext carbon market and the Swiss national registry. The decision by those entities to close temporarily was taken to permit them to undertake a review of their systems and practices to prevent a similar occurrence in the future. The trustee confirmed to the Board that Adaptation Fund CERs had not been affected, but insofar as electronic theft from national entities was possible, Adaptation Fund CERs could be at risk prior to their monetization by the trustee. The trustee reported that, of the 2.82 million tons Adaptation Fund CERs remaining to be monetized, only 85 thousand tons and 35 thousand tons CERs were currently at the BlueNext Swiss Registry and Independent Swiss Registry, respectively. As a result of the closure of those registries, CER sales had been suspended since early February 2011. However the trustee reported that additional options were available to monetize CERs should that situation persist.

77. The Board took note of the presentation by the Trustee

Financial status of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund

78. The trustee presented the report on the Financial Status of the Adaptation Fund trust fund as at 31 January 2011 (AFB/EFC.4/10), and reported on both activities since the last meeting, as well as on the CER monetization program. The trustee said that following the CMP decision to extend the mandate of the World Bank as interim trustee, by approving an amendment to the terms and conditions of services of the World Bank as the trustee of the Adaptation Fund, the Executive Directors of the World Bank had taken the decision to adopt the amendment to the terms and conditions in mid February, 2011. A second funds transfer had also been made in respect of projects and programs, in favour of Honduras. The financial status of the Adaptation Fund is further described in the report of the trustee (AFB/EFC.4/10/Rev.2), which also contained information on Board approvals to date broken, down by Implementing Entities: MIEs (64%) and NIEs (36%). The trustee also reported that the funds available to support new Board funding decisions amounted to US\$ 186.98 million.

79. The Board took note of the report presented by the trustee.

Agenda Item 12: Board meetings for 2011

80. The Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat confirmed the dates for the June 2011 meeting in Bonn, Germany. She said that the 14th meeting would take place in Bonn from Tuesday, 21 June until Wednesday, 22 June, 2011. The meeting of the Board would be held back-to-back with the fifth meetings of the Project and Programme Review Committee and the Ethics and Finance Committee which would be held in Bonn on Monday, June 20, 2011.

81. The Board took note of dates of its 14th meeting.

Agenda Item 13: Dialogue with civil society

82. Mr. Sven Harmeling, Germanwatch, thanked the Board for the opportunity to make a presentation to the Board. He said that because of the mechanism of direct access the Adaptation Fund occupied a special place among those organizations dealing with the issue of climate change, and that it was important to make its work better known to the public. To that end the civil society had held a press briefing on March 16, 2011. He also stressed that it was important for the Green Climate Fund to have the input of the Adaptation Fund Board and that it would be important for the Board to continue to establish priorities for vulnerable countries.

83. Ms. Indi McLymont-Lafayette, Panos Caribbean, seconded the views of Mr. Harmeling and said that she had participated in the press conference as well. She thanked the Board for its dialogue with civil society.

84. Mr. Emmanuel Seck, Environmental Development Action (ENDA) in the Third World, said that it was important that the public was made aware of climate change issues, and the work of the Board. On the project for Senegal, after reviewing the project components, also he reminded the Board of the importance of capacity-building in that country.

85. Ms Adekemi Seesink, of Wetlands International, said that Civil Society had noted the importance that the Board had attached to the participation of stakeholders in the review process.

86. Mr. Ricardo Lozano Picon (Colombia, Non-Annex I Parties) said that it was important to hear the input from Civil Society and he thanked the observers for their support of the Board.

87. At the same time the Board also heard an update by a representative of UNDP on the process initiated by UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank for helping in the creation of NIEs. She reported that UNDP was working with the Government of Burkina Faso to assist in the identification of a potential NIE and informed that she will report back to the Board once results have been achieved.

Agenda Item 14: Other matters

The definition of conflicts of interest

88. The Board did not take up the issue of the definition of conflicts of interest due to the absence of the member who had proposed the issue.

Minutes of silence for Japan and the victims of catastrophes and calamities

89. The Board also held a minute of silence for Japan and all those who had perished in catastrophes and calamities since the start of the present year.

The support for the accreditation of NIEs and MIE involvement in NIE capacity-building

90. Several Board members emphasized the importance of accrediting additional NIEs while maintaining the approved fiduciary standards. It was suggested that it might be possible to ask those MIEs that were already accredited to help in that process, and even insist that the future approval of projects being submitted by MIEs contain a component for NIE capacity-building. Others considered that it was unrealistic to expect MIEs to help with that process as MIEs and NIEs were essentially competitors for the funding of their own projects. It was also pointed out that MIEs were already in a position to support the creation of NIEs but were as yet, doing little to support that, and in any case not all MIEs were sufficiently active in enough countries to be able to achieve that goal.

91. Following the discussion, the Board decided to invite the Multilateral Implementing Entities to present the results of their capacity-building activities for National Implementing Entities.

(Decision B.13/30)

Participation of the Adaption Fund Board in the Transitional Committee of the Green Fund

92. The previous Chair reminded the Board of paragraph 111 of decision 1/CP.16 that requests the UNFCCC secretariat, in consultation with the President of the Conference of the Parties, to make arrangements enabling relevant United Nations agencies, international financial institutions and multilateral development banks, along with the secretariat and the Global Environment Facility, to second staff to support the work of the Transitional Committee for the design phase of the Green Climate Fund.

93. Following the discussion, the Board decided to send a letter to the President of COP 16/CMP 6 and to the Executive Secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change requesting that the Adaptation Fund Board and its secretariat be invited to participate in the work of the Transitional Committee pursuant to paragraph 111 of decision 1/CP.16. Once the meeting schedule is made public, the secretariat will circulate an intersessional decision addressing the budgetary implications of attending the transitional committee meetings to the Board for its approval.

(Decision B.13/31)

Agenda of the first Board meeting of each year

94. Following a proposal by the Chair, the Board decided that the incoming Chair assisted by the secretariat will prepare the agenda of the first Board meeting of each year.

(Decision B.13/32)

Greening the Adaptation Fund Board meetings

95. The Board decided to approve the secretariat's proposal to make its meetings paperless, while maintaining the option of producing paper copies, both upon request and for those documents produced during the meetings of the Board or finalized less than one week before a Board meeting.

(Decision B.13/33)

Agenda Item 15: Adoption of the report

96. The present report was prepared based on AFB/B.13/L.1, as orally amended, for intersessional adoption by the Board.

Agenda Item 16: Closure of the Meeting

97. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the meeting closed on Friday, 18 March 2011 at 6.55 p.m.

**ANNEX I: MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PARTICIPATING AT THE THIRTEENTH
MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD**

MEMBERS		
Name	Country	Constituency
Mr. Cheikh Ndiaye Sylla	Senegal	Africa
Mr. Zaheer Fakir	South Africa	Africa
Mr. Abdulhadi Al-Marri	Qatar	Asia
Ms. Medea Inashvili	Georgia	Eastern Europe
Mr. Jeffery Spooner	Jamaica	Latin America and the Caribbean
Mr. Luis Santos	Uruguay	Latin America and the Caribbean
Mr. Hans Olav Ibrekk	Norway	Western European and Others Group
Ms. Angela Churie-Kallhauge	Sweden	Western European and Others Group
Mr. Peceli Vocea	Fiji	Small Island Developing States
Mr. Richard Muyungi	Tanzania	Least-Developed Countries
Ms. Ana Fornells de Frutos	Spain	Annex I Parties
Mr. Ricardo Lozano Picón	Colombia	Non-Annex I Parties
Mr. Farrukh Iqbal Khan	Pakistan	Non-Annex I Parties

ALTERNATES		
Name	Country	Constituency
Mr. Richard Mwendandu	Kenya	Africa
Mr. Ezzat Lewis Hannalla Agaiby	Egypt	Africa
Mr. Damdin Davgadorj	Mongolia	Asia
Mr. Valeriu Cazac	Moldova	Eastern Europe
Ms. Iryna Trofimova	Ukraine	Eastern Europe
Mr. Luis Paz Castro	Cuba	Latin America and the Caribbean
Mr. Santiago Reyna	Argentina	Latin America and the Caribbean
Mr. Anton Hilber	Switzerland	Western European and Others Group
Mr. Markku Kanninen	Finland	Western European and Others Group
Mr. Amjad Abdulla	Maldives	Small Island Developing States
Mr. Mirza Shawkat Ali	Bangladesh	Least-Developed Countries
Ms. Kate Binns	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Annex I Parties
Mr. Yutaka Matsuzawa	Japan	Annex I Parties
Ms. Sally Biney	Ghana	Non-Annex I Parties
Mr. Bruno Sekoli	Lesotho	Non-Annex I Parties

ANNEX II: ADOPTED AGENDA OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Transition of the Chair and the Vice Chair
3. Organizational matters
 - (a) *Adoption of the agenda*
 - (b) *Organization of work*
 - (c) *Declarations of conflict of interest*
4. Report on intersessional activities of the Chair
5. Secretariat activities
6. Report of the fifth meeting of the Accreditation Panel
 - (a) *Regional workshops on accreditation of NIEs mandated by CMP6*
7. Report of the fourth meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC):
 - (a) *Content of the PPRC report*
 - (b) *Issues identified during project and programme review*
 - (c) *Project and programme proposals*
8. Report of the fourth meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC):
 - (a) *Results Based Management (RBM) issues*
 - (b) *Evaluation issues*
 - (c) *Desk study on execution costs*
 - (d) *Initial funding priorities and resource allocation for the Adaptation Fund*
 - (e) *Review of the operational policies and guidelines and related templates*
 - (f) *Implementation of the code of conduct*
 - (g) *Performance study on the secretariat and trustee: consideration of the draft TORs*
 - (h) *Financial issues*
9. Issues Remaining from the 12th Board meeting
 - (a) *Vulnerability*
 - (b) *Accreditation of non-invited multilateral institutions*
10. Communications strategy
11. Financial issues
 - (a) *CER Monetization*
 - (b) *Financial status of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund*
12. Future board meetings
13. Dialogue with civil society
14. Other Matters

15. Adoption of the report
16. Closure of the Meeting

ANNEX III: REPORT ON INTERSESSIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE OUTGOING CHAIR**Farrukh Iqbal Khan, Outgoing Chair**

Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished Board members, Madame the Head of the Secretariat of the Adaptation Fund Board, staff of the secretariat, dear observers,

1. Following a year of having the privilege to act as the Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board, I stand before you for the last time at this position. It has been an honour, a privilege and a journey worth the time and effort.
2. Looking back, when we started the year 2010 and I assumed the chairmanship of the Board, while its institutional framework was already in place, Implementing Entities had yet to be accredited and the process of project reviewing had not started. On the funding side, very few donations were pledged. Finally, the Board had no legal capacity.
3. I think those challenges were enormous for Fund and the Board. However, today when I stand before you, I must admit that this Board has successfully overcome and for which you – its members - those sitting behind – the civil society and observers – the Secretariat – those doing hard work, deserve commendation. Here I would particularly cite Mr. Jan Cedergren, who has been instrumental in the process of the adoption of the operational framework of the Fund and the agreement on legal capacity with Germany, and also Mr. Richard Muyungi for leading the Board throughout its initial steps, including the design of its legal framework, and the establishment of 2 Board Committees.
4. During the past three years, the Board had been intensively engaged in erecting its institutional framework. Today, it is operational despite resource constraints and its relatively young age. One of the main tasks before the Board has been to operationalize the direct access modality, and we are proud to witness today that direct access has become a reality and not merely a concept.
5. The Accreditation Panel, established last year in February 2010, has held five meetings since then. We have accredited three National Implementing entities: the Center for Ecological Monitoring of Senegal, the Planning Institute of Jamaica and the National Agency for Research and Innovation of Uruguay; in addition to seven multilateral entities.
6. The results obtained thus far on the accreditation side are not enough, however. To fulfill the vision of the Fund, more accredited NIEs are needed, but we bear also the responsibility of doing it right, making sure that all the necessary standards are met.
7. We should be proud of the efforts that we have made both on the side of the Board, through its secretariat, and the Parties to the Convention through the UNFCCC Secretariat. An NIE Accreditation toolkit has been developed and is now available for the countries. This will help them in better identifying NIE candidates and walk them through the process of accreditation. In addition, 4 UNFCCC workshops on NIE accreditation will take place within the next 2 years. I have also communicated to donors and multilateral agencies underlining the need assistance in establishing National Implementing Entities. Here again, the joint initiative by UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank to support countries in establishing NIEs is worth noting.
8. We have also successfully established principles and practices in handling the affairs of the Ethics and Finance Committee and the Project and Programme Review Committees. A new leadership has taken over those two important committees. The two committees have done

important work by approving project and programme proposals; approval of the code of conduct of the Board; the results based management framework and the establishment of a cap for implementing entities fees.

9. On the projects side, the Board has considered 31 projects concepts and proposals, out of which four have been approved for funding. These cover a broad range of areas such as rural development, agriculture, water resources management, food security, coastal management and disaster risk reduction. All regions are represented among them. Since January 2011, the first project has started implementation.

10. I am pleased to report that on November 26, 2010 the German Parliament approved the law that confers legal capacity to the Board. It entered into force when it was published in the national gazette on February, 8th 2011. A copy of the gazette was handed over yesterday to the Board.

11. We have moved rapidly by concluding Agreements between the Board and its Implementing Entities – UNDP in particular – for the implementation of projects in Honduras, Nicaragua and Pakistan. I have signed the transfer forms as well, which were sent to the Trustee for the disbursement of the first tranches for these projects.

12. Further, following a request from the Board I had the privilege to present to the CMP the extension of the mandate of our interim trustee, the World Bank, for three additional years. The CMP accepted the proposal. Last month, the World Bank Executive Directors agreed to extension as well.

13. Finally, I would like to refer to the resources of the Fund. The revenues generated by the monetization programme initiated last year amount to over 130 million. Further, contributions from the Governments of Spain, Monaco, Germany and Sweden have been received. As of October 31, 2010, the total cash contributions received by the trustee amounted to US\$ 70.95 million. The total funds available for funding decisions as of October 31, 2010 are US\$ 156.28 million. We are expecting contribution by Australia and the Brussels Capital Region.

14. I would like to express my gratitude to the Governments that have contributed to the Fund. However, the resources available are far from being sufficient to tackle the adaptation needs of developing countries. For the Fund to deliver properly a substantial increase in its resources is crucial. Thus I would like to reiterate my request to Annex I Parties to the UNFCCC and international organizations to continue to support the Adaptation Fund and provide additional funding.

Dear Board Members,

15. While we have achieved much, there road ahead is still full of winding curves and challenging heights. Amongst the obvious tasks before the Board include

- a. Strengthening the project review framework to increase the transparency of the process;
- b. Reviewing the operational policies and guidelines;
- c. Reaching an agreement on the definition of initial funding priorities and resource allocation for the Adaptation Fund and

- d. Establishment of an evaluation framework, among other key policies and strategies that will help improve the functioning of the Fund.
- e. Strengthening relationship with the civil society and how we can integrate their valuable input in the work of this Board;
- f. Evolving a way forward to integrate this Board with the evolving financial mechanism of the Convention notably those resulting from the Cancun Agreements;

16. In handling these issues, I hope the Board will take a careful look at the proposal that the Chair circulated at its 12th Meeting on Cancun concerning the initial funding priorities and vulnerability question.

Dear Members,

17. During the past one year, I received a number of invitations to present the work of the Board, which demonstrates the significant interest in your activities. I have also written a number of articles and given numerous interviews about the Fund. I recently participated in the discussion panel on key policy issues for LDC governments, organized by UNDP.

18. I would also like to thank the Board members who have supported me by attending some of the meetings on my behalf. Their efforts have assisted me in disseminating the vision of the Board and our priorities moving forward. I am taking this opportunity to thank in particular Ms. Kate Binns for attending the Commonwealth meeting in London last January.

19. I am now turning to Ms. Ana Fornells de Frutos, who will be in charge over the next twelve months. Let me first congratulate you and offer my full support in the difficult task that awaits you. The Adaptation Fund has now reached a crucial phase of its existence in a context of transition, marked in particular by the emergence of a new global climate change financing. I would invite her to lead the way in enabling the Adaptation Fund to play pivotal a role in the future architecture of the financial mechanism for climate change. The innovative features and the experience built in this Fund deserve to be preserved, shared and replicated.

20. Ladies and gentlemen members of the Board, dear observers, staff of the secretariat, as I speak to you for the last time as Chair of this Board, I would like to sincerely thank you for giving me the opportunity to contribute to the evolution of the fund, as well as for all the support you have given me during these past 12 months. I hope that my efforts will have had a lasting effect on the Fund and in my capacity as a Board member, I hope to continue to contribute to the success of the Adaptation Fund. I would specifically like to mention Marcia Levaggi, our Manager who has often put up with my rather difficult demands and temper.

21. Before, I close let me also thank Ms. Barbut, Head of the Adaptation Fund Secretariat for her pivotal role by providing extremely important support both by hiring the dedicated staff as well as by seconding the GEF staff.

22. Thank you very much.

ANNEX IV: ACCREDITATION PANEL'S OBSERVATIONS OF NIE 1

Based on the documents and evidence provided by NIE 1 and the field visit, the following are the Accreditation Panel's conclusions regarding the application of NIE 1:

1. The accounting system followed is in line with the requirements of the Government of NIE 1 and is acceptable. Project accounting though undertaken offers considerable scope for improvement.
2. There is no internal audit function within the department/ministry.
3. External audit for foreign aided projects is undertaken for all such projects being implemented by the Government. Some reports made available were scrutinized and a large number of audit irregularities were observed on which virtually no action has been taken. The system for follow-up on audit irregularities is very weak across all ministries/departments and little meaningful action gets taken, a fact observed even in other multilateral funded projects for the year 2008 undertaken by NIE 1.
4. The internal control framework is weak resulting in a payment and disbursement system which is not able to prevent improper use of funds. Also several of the audit reports note non-compliance to financial rules and regulations in the implementation of various projects (most of these may not relate to NIE 1 but even for projects to be undertaken by NIE 1 implementation will be across ministries)
5. There has been some improvement in procurement transparency and openness since 2008. However, all multilateral lending agencies keep a tight control over the procurement process for projects funded by them through their representatives in the country and consider project procurement a continuing risk. Such a control would not take place under the direct access methodology. It is noted that while there is improvement, project procurement risks still exist in projects undertaken by the Government.
6. The Government and NIE 1 have developed adequate capabilities for project design and appraisal.
7. The system of project implementation is not adequately developed. The people responsible for project implementation, in most cases, do not possess specialized skills and competence required for project management. Also NIE 1 has little experience of handling large projects, a fact observed by several of the multilateral and donor agencies also. One of the points emerging in the discussions during the field visit related to major problems of co-ordination between ministries for project implementation.
8. The external monitoring of project implementation and evaluation is undertaken by a unit with neither adequate resources nor competence to undertake meaningful and exhaustive monitoring and evaluation.
9. The orientation towards prevention of fraud and financial mismanagement is low both in terms of structure to deal with this issue and adequate evidence of commitment for taking appropriate action.

Given the above status the accreditation of NIE 1 is not recommended.

ANNEX V: ACCREDITATION PANEL'S OBSERVATIONS OF NIE 2*Rationale for Non- Accreditation*

Based on the documents made available to the Accreditation Panel through the Adaptation Fund Secretariat, the following are the conclusions of the Accreditation Panel regarding the application of NIE 2:

1. While examining the comparative advantage of the applicant in terms of undertaking and executing concrete adaptation projects, it was conclusive that the applicant lacked policies and procedures needed to be used for project management (in the areas of project identification, initiation, execution, monitoring, reporting and evaluation).
2. There is no internal audit section/division/function available within the NIE.
3. There is no demonstration of existence of a control framework which states the roles, responsibilities and financial authorities of the concerned staff.
4. There is no documentary evidence or demonstration of any payment/disbursement system.
5. There is no evidence as to how the corporate/project/departmental budgets are prepared or any demonstration of how budgets are monitored with respect to the expenditures.
6. There is no clear demonstration of how the procurement policy is effectively monitored or followed with regards to the donor funded projects.
7. As the NIE has not handled any major projects in the past, it is difficult at this point to determine how effectively the monitoring and evaluation aspects of the project would be handled by the NIE.
8. There is no effective systems and process in place to address the project-at-risk system.
9. The NIE has not provided sufficient documents to address the capacity in handling/overseeing the technical, financial, economic, social, environmental, and legal aspects of the projects. The panel recognized that the NIE has not had the opportunity being small to demonstrate this capability since it is relatively new in implementing/executing major projects. However it was unable to identify the existence of such control mechanism of process and procedures in place that would assist the NIE in handling projects execution in the future.
10. The NIE states that it has not had any financial mismanagement so far, but what is lacking is clear demonstration of a policy of zero tolerance for fraud supported by relevant policies and procedures as to how the NIE will handle such cases in the future.

Conclusion:

Based on the above points the Accreditation Panel has concluded that is not in a position to recommend accreditation to NIE 2.

ANNEX VI: CLARIFICATION OF THE FIDUCIARY STANDARDS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Draft paper on the Fiduciary Standards proposed by the Accreditation Panel – 21 Feb 2011 **SECTION I: Background/Contact**

Nominated Entity (if NIE):
Invited Entity (if MIE):
Address:
Country:
Postal Code:
Telephone:
Fax:
Web Address:
Contact Person:
Telephone:
Email:

**SECTION II: Financial Management and Integrity** **Specific Capability Required**

- a) Legal status to contract with Adaptation Fund Board)
- b) Accurately and regularly record transactions and balances in a manner that adheres to broadly accepted good practices, and are audited periodically by an independent firm or organization;
- c) Managing and disbursing funds efficiently and with safeguards to recipients on a timely basis;
- d) Produce forward-looking financial plans and budgets

	Required competency	Specific capability required	Supporting documentation that should be provided
	Legal Status	Demonstration of necessary legal personality	Documentation of legal status and mandate (please highlight the relevant paragraphs)
		Demonstration of legal capacity/authority and the ability to directly receive funds Legal basis and mandate to perform functions as an NIE	i) Same documentation or separate supporting documentation ii) List of foreign loan/donor funds handled over the last 2 years
	Financial statements including Project Accounts statement and the provisions for Internal and External Audits	Production of reliable financial statements that are prepared in accordance with internationally recognized accounting standards	Audited Financial Statements
		Production of annual externally audited accounts that are consistent with recognized international auditing standards	i) External Auditor Reports ii) Audit Committee's Terms of Reference and
		Demonstration of use of accounting packages that are recognised and familiar to accounting procedures in developing countries	Name and brief description of accounting package used
		Demonstration of capability for functionally independent internal auditing in accordance with internationally recognized standards	i) Policy/charter and other published documents (like manuals) that outline the entity's internal auditing function ii) Copies of audit plans for last 2 years and the current year iii) List of internal audit reports of last 2 years and sample reports

	Internal Control Framework with particular reference to control over disbursements and payments	Demonstration of use of a control framework that is documented with clearly defined roles for management, internal auditors, the governing body, and other personnel	Policy or other published document that outlines the entity's control framework
		Demonstration of proven payment/disbursement systems	Procedures describing the payment/ disbursement system with particular reference to project payments/ disbursements
	Preparation of Business Plans and Budgets and ability to monitor expenditure in line with budgets	Production of long term business plans/ financial projections demonstrating financial solvency	Long Term Business plans or Financial Projections for the next 3 to 5 years
		Evidence of preparation of corporate, departmental/ ministry budgets and demonstration of ability to spend against budgets	i) Annual budgets for the organization and entities within it ii) End of calendar year/fiscal year or periodical budget report



SECTION III: Requisite Institutional Capacity

■ Specific Capability Required

- A) Ability to manage procurement procedures which provide for transparent practices, including competition
- B) Ability to identify, develop and appraise projects
- C) Competency to manage or oversee the execution of projects/programmes, including ability to manage sub-recipients and to support project/programme delivery and implementation
- D) Capacity to undertake monitoring and evaluation

	Required competency	Specific capability required	Supporting documentation that may be provided
	Procurement	Evidence of transparent and fair procurement policies and procedures at the national level that are consistent with recognized international practice (including dispute resolution procedures)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Procurement Policy ii) Detailed procedures or guidelines including composition and role of key decision making committees iii) Provisions for oversight/audit /review of the procurement function with an actual sample of oversight/audit/review reports iv) Procedures for handling/controlling procurement in Executing Agencies
	Project preparation and approval. This should include impact (environment, socio-economic, political, etc) assessment study with risk assessment and mitigation plans	Demonstration of capability and experience in identification and design of projects (preferably adaptation projects)	Detailed project plan documents for 2 projects
		Demonstration of availability of/ access to resources and track record of conducting appraisal activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Details of the project approval process/procedure ii) 2 samples of project appraisals undertaken
		Demonstration of the ability to examine and incorporate the likely impact of technical, financial, economic, social, environmental, and legal aspects into the project at the appraisal stage itself	Sample of project documents which demonstrate this capability

		Evidence procedures/framework in place to undertake risk assessment and integrate mitigation strategies/plans into the project document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Policy and/or other published document(s) that outline the risk assessment procedures/framework ii) 2 samples of completed project appraisals with identified risks and corresponding mitigation strategies/plans
	Project implementation Planning and Quality-at-entry Review	Evidence of institutional system for planning implementation of projects with particular emphasis for quality-at-entry	Operational manual or written procedures for project review system during the design phase
		Evidence of preparation of project budgets for projects being handled by the entity or any sub-entity within it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Project budgets ii) Analysis of project expenditure vs budget
	Project Monitoring and Evaluation during implementation	Demonstration of existing capacities for monitoring and independent evaluation that are consistent with the requirements of the Adaptation Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Policy or other published document that outlines monitoring and evaluation requirements ii) Detailed procedures and formats used for monitoring and evaluation during project implementation iii) Sample project monitoring and evaluation reports
		Production of detailed project accounts which are externally audited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Sample of project accounts ii) Sample of project audit reports

		Evidence of a process or system, such as a project-at-risk system, that is in place to flag when a project has developed problems that may interfere with the achievement of its objectives, and to respond to redress the problems	Procedures for project-at-risk system or similar process/system to ensure speedy solutions to problems which may interfere with the achievement of the project objectives
	Project closure and final evaluation	Demonstration of an understanding of and capacity to assess impact/implications of the technical, financial, economic, social, environmental, and legal aspects of projects	Project closure reports or independent evaluation reports containing assessment of the impact/implications of the technical, financial, economic, social, environmental, and legal aspects of projects
		Demonstration of competence to execute or oversee execution of projects/programmes	Independent evaluation reports of completed projects/programmes

SECTION IV: Transparency, self-investigative powers, and anti-corruption measures

■ Specific Capability Required

- a) Competence to deal with financial mismanagement and other forms of malpractice

	Required competency	Specific capability required	Supporting documentation that may be provided
	Policies and Framework to deal with financial mismanagement and other forms of malpractices	Evidence/tone/statement from the top emphasising a policy of zero tolerance for fraud, financial mismanagement and other forms of malpractice by implementing entity staff or from any external sources associated directly or indirectly with the projects	Provide evidence of a statement communicating such a policy of zero tolerance for fraud, financial mismanagement and other forms of malpractice
		Demonstration of capacity and procedures to deal with financial mismanagement and other forms of malpractice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Provide copy of documented code of conduct/ethics applicable to the staff ii) Documentation establishing avenues for reporting non-compliance/ violation/misconduct and business conduct concerns iii) Details of policies and procedures relating to managing conflict of interest and whistle blower protection
		Evidence of an objective investigation function for allegations of fraud and corruption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The structure and process/ procedures within the organization to handle cases of fraud and mismanagement and undertake necessary investigative activities. ii) Data on cases of violation of code of conduct/ethics and frauds reported over last 2 years provided in terms of number of cases, types of iii) violations and summary of status/action taken. iv) Periodical oversight reports of the ethics function/ committee be attached for the last 2 years

ANNEX VII: FUNDING DECISIONS AND BUDGET AMENDMENTS

	Country/Title	IE	Document Ref	Project	Fee	NIE	MIE	IE fee %	Total Amount	Decision
1. Projects and Programs:	Ecuador	WFP	PPRC.4/5	6,962,120.00	487,348.00		7,449,468.00	7.0%	7,449,468.00	Approved
	Eritrea	UNDP	PPRC.4/6	6,010,000.00	510,850.00		6,520,850.00	8.5%	6,520,850.00	Approved
	Solomon Islands	UNDP	PPRC.4/7	5,100,000.00	433,500.00		5,533,500.00	8.5%	5,533,500.00	Approved
	Tanzania	UNEP	PPRC.4/8	9,045,638.00	768,879.00		9,814,517.00	8.5%	0.00	Not approved
	Sub-total			27,117,758.00	2,200,577.00		29,318,335.00	8.1%	19,503,818.00	
2. Project Formulation Grant:	Uruguay	ANII	PPRC.4/4						30,000.00	Approved
	Sub-total								30,000.00	
3. Budget:	Accreditation Panel's site visit to review IE3		AFB/B.13/4						22,000.00	Approved
	Accreditation Panel's site visit to review IE4		AFB/B.13/4						22,000.00	Approved
	Independent Performance Review								50,000.00	Approved
	Trustee net budget for FY11 Q4		AFB/EFC.4/11						127,479.00	Approved
	Sub-total								221,479.00	
4. Concepts:	Uruguay	ANII	PPRC.4/4	7,000,000.00	350,000.00	7,350,000.00		5.0%	7,350,000.00	Endorsed
	Sub-total			7,000,000.00	350,000.00	7,350,000.00			7,350,000.00	
5. Total (5 = 1 + 2 + 3 + 4)									27,105,297.00	

ANNEX VIII: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PERFORMANCE STUDY

Terms of Reference for Hiring the Consultant to Conduct an Independent Review of the Interim trustee and the Interim Secretariat Servicing the Adaptation Fund Board

BACKGROUND

At the third session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP), which was held in Bali, Indonesia from 3-14 December 2007, Parties in decision [1/CMP.3](#) decided to establish the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) as the operating entity to supervise and manage the Adaptation Fund, under the authority and guidance of the CMP. The AFB is fully accountable to the CMP, which decides on the overall policies of the Adaptation Fund.

Upon invitation from Parties, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) provides [secretariat services to the AFB](#) and the World Bank serves as trustee of the Adaptation Fund on an interim basis. These interim institutional arrangements will be reviewed in 2011.

At CMP 4, Parties expressed their appreciation to the AFB for having carried out the functions of its work plan, in accordance with decisions 5/CMP.2 and 1/CMP.3, and urged it to continue to do so with a view to fully operationalizing the Adaptation Fund. Parties in decision [1/CMP.4](#) also adopted the rules of procedure of the Adaptation Fund Board. The CMP encouraged the AFB to keep its rules of procedure under review and, if necessary, make recommendations concerning any amendments aimed at enabling the AFB to function in an efficient, cost-effective and transparent manner.

At CMP 5, Parties endorsed the decision of the AFB to accept the offer of Germany to confer legal capacity on the AFB and invited Germany to make the necessary arrangements. Parties also adopted the amendments to the rules of procedure of the AFB as contained in the annex of decision [4/CMP.5](#).

At CMP 6, Parties expressed appreciation to the Government of Germany for conferring legal capacity on the AFB. And requested the Adaptation Fund Board to undertake independent performance reviews of the interim secretariat and the interim trustee servicing the Adaptation Fund.

With a view to conducting this Independent review, the Adaptation Fund Board requires the services of a consultant to present a report for information and review by the Adaptation Fund Board prior to its fifteenth meeting in September 2011.

Objective

As per the terms of reference established by the CMP, the objective of this initial review is to ensure the effectiveness and adequacy of the Adaptation Fund and its interim institutional arrangements, with a view to the CMP adopting an appropriate decision on this matter at its seventh session.

The following Terms of Reference will govern the award of contract and performance reviews of the Interim Secretariat (Global Environmental Facility) and the Interim Trustee (The World Bank) servicing the Adaptation Fund.

The candidate should:

- Be familiar with the managing of global institutions such as the Adaptation Fund.
- Have expertise on governance and accountability issues, including expertise with regard to fiduciary issues, financial management, and auditing
- Have a degree in social science, business management, project management and/or public administration.
- Have relevant experience in climate change, and/or development/project development related work for at least 10 years.
- Demonstrate analytical and writing skills and ability to assess complex situations.
- Have an excellent command of written and oral English.

In accordance with the 5th Conference of Parties Serving as Meeting of Parties (CMP) decision, the performance review should be placed before the sixth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP). Consequently, the Consultant would be required to submit the performance review latest by the sixteenth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board in 2011.

In carrying out this review, the consultant shall take into account the following:

For the:

Secretariat

- i. Legal arrangements between the Adaptation Fund Board and the Secretariat;
- ii. Adequacy of planning and implementation process of activities;
- iii. Coherence and effectiveness in the project review process in line with the AFB's operational policies and guidelines;
- iv. Staff and officers dedicated to undertake activities assigned to the AFB Secretariat;
- v. Cost effectiveness of the budget allocated to non-dedicated and dedicated staff;
- vi. Financial practices of other Secretariats;
- vii. Interaction with the implementing entities and other relevant bodies of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol;
- viii. Cost effectiveness and necessity of maintaining the Secretariat services against an independent Secretariat;

Trustee

- i. Legal arrangements between the AFB and the Trustee and the arrangements between other organizations;
- ii. Cost effectiveness of the administrative services rendered by the Trustee for the Adaptation Fund Board;
- iii. Cost effectiveness of the management of Certified Emission Reduction Certificates (CERs) including its sale to the markets
- iv. Evaluation of the trust fund management and disbursement policy
- v. Adequacy and effectiveness of the reporting to the Adaptation Fund Board

In carrying out the study, the consultant will identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and any risks to the Adaptation Fund and will make recommendations to address and improve these arrangements between the Adaptation Fund Board and the Secretariat and the Trustee.

The consultant shall also seek the opinion of the relevant persons, in particular the Chair and the Vice Chair, and institutions and other relevant sources of information deemed useful.

Once the Secretariat receives the bids, these will be forwarded to the members of the Ethics and Finance Committee for an initial review and recommendation to the Board for appointment through a sessional or inter-sessional decision.

To apply:

Please send applications including a CV and letter of intent by May 9, 2011 to secretariat@adaptation-fund.org, copying AFornells@mma.es