



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/B.22/L.1  
1 November 2013

---

**ADAPTATION FUND BOARD**

Twenty-second meeting  
Bonn, Germany, 31 October – 1 November 2013

**DECISIONS OF THE TWENTY-SECOND MEETING  
OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD**

**Agenda Item 3: Report on activities of the Chair**

1. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the report on the activities of the Chair.

**Agenda Item 4: Report on activities of the secretariat**

2. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the report by the secretariat.

**Agenda Item 5: Report of the Accreditation Panel**

*Accreditation of the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)*

3. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to accredit the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) as a Regional Implementing Entity (RIE).

**(Decision B.22/1)**

*Small Grants Window*

4. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to
  - a) Allow for further review of NIE039 through a field visit to develop a case example for the need of a “small grant window” or similar mechanism; and

- b) Request the Accreditation Panel to work in conjunction with the secretariat to provide options for how such a mechanism could be operationalized at the twenty-third Board meeting.

**(Decision B.22/2)**

*Re-accreditation process*

5. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to adopt the re-accreditation process outlined in Annex III of the report of the fourteenth meeting of the Accreditation Panel (AFB/B.22/4).

**(Decision B.22/3)**

**Agenda Item 6: Report of the thirteenth meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee**

***Review of project and programme proposals***

Concepts

*Proposals from National Implementing Entities*

Chile – Enhancing resilience to climate change of the small agriculture in the Chilean region of O’Higgins. (Project Concept; Agencia de Cooperación Internacional (AGCI); CHL/NIE/Agri/2013/1; US\$ 9,970,000)

6. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- a) Not endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Agencia de Cooperación Internacional (AGCI) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Suggest that AGCI reformulates the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The proposal should clearly articulate the expected climate change effects on rural farm communities in the O’Higgins region of Chile with respect to current climate variability and future climate change, in order that the appropriateness of the proposed adaptation measures can be assessed;
  - (ii) The proposal should describe how the proposed activities will deliver concrete adaptation benefits to smallholder and subsistence farmers to reduce their vulnerability to climate variability and climate change;

- (iii) The proposal should explain how the project intends to collect, analyse and disseminate climatic information that will be directly relevant to smallholder and subsistence farmers in a timely and appropriate manner;
  - (iv) The proposal should discuss how the maintenance and support of the proposed activities has been considered, with a view to ensuring the long-term sustainability of the outcomes achieved through the project;
  - (v) The proposal should reduce the requested Implementing Entity management fee to be within the cap of 8.5 per cent, as well as ensure the requested total financing is reported consistently throughout.
- c) Not to approve the Project Formulation Grant of US\$ 30,000; and
  - d) Request AGCI to transmit the observations referred to in sub-paragraph (b) to the Government of Chile.

**(Decision B.22/4)**

Costa Rica – Reducing the vulnerability by focusing on critical sectors (agriculture, water resources and coastlines) in order to reduce the negative impacts of climate change and improve the resilience of these sectors. (Programme Concept; Fundecooperación para el Desarrollo Sostenible; CRI/NIE/Multi/2013/1; US\$ 9,970,000)

7. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Endorse the programme concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by Fundecooperación para el Desarrollo Sostenible (Fundecooperación) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) Request the secretariat to transmit to Fundecooperación the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The fully-developed programme document should clearly articulate how the proposed technical options enhance climate resilience in the agricultural sector and access to clean and safe water. Specific reference should be made to how the proposed activities are designed to be commensurate in overcoming the climate impacts in the areas of intervention in the context of climate change in Costa Rica;
  - (ii) The fully-developed programme document should detail how the proposed insurance schemes are designed to alleviate climate impacts rather than being based on the occurrence of previously established climate events;
  - (iii) The fully-developed programme document should make specific reference to the goal of the reimbursable funds for the implementation of sustainable

management practices for water, and investment in new infrastructure, addressing how these funds would work, who would manage them, what source of funds would be used to finance them, and how the financing of the fund would be sustained in the long term.

- (c) Approve the Programme Formulation Grant of US\$ 30,000;
- (d) Request Fundecooperación to transmit the observations referred to in subparagraph (b) to the Government of Costa Rica; and
- (e) Encourage the Government of Costa Rica to submit through Fundecooperación a fully-developed programme proposal that would address the observations under subparagraph (b).

**(Decision B.22/5)**

Jordan: Increasing resilience of the poor and vulnerable communities to climate change impacts in Jordan through implementing innovative projects in water and agriculture in support of adaptation to climate change (Programme Concept; Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC); JOR/NIE/Multi/2012/1; US\$ 9,226,000)

8. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Endorse the programme document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation (MOPIC) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) Request the secretariat to transmit to MOPIC the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The fully-developed programme document should clearly explain how the different projects and stakeholders within the programme will be coordinated during its implementation;
  - (ii) More specific information should be provided about the criteria to be applied to determine the vulnerability of the target communities under projects 1.2 to 1.4;
  - (iii) The relevant existing policies and standards for all the activities of the programme will need to be specified in greater detail in the fully-developed programme document;
  - (iv) At the fully-developed programme document stage the synergies to be sought and coordination mechanisms with existing initiatives should be outlined;

- (v) The fully-developed programme document should demonstrate that each project under the programme has been designed with full participation of relevant stakeholders, including vulnerable groups, and taking into account gender consideration.
- (c) Approve the Programme Formulation Grant of US\$ 29,500;
- (d) Request MOPIC to transmit the observations under sub-paragraph (b) to the Government of Jordan; and
- (e) Encourage the Government of Jordan to submit through MOPIC a fully-developed programme proposal that would address the observations under sub-paragraph (b).

**(Decision B.22/6)**

Morocco: Climate changes adaptation project in oasis zones (Project Concept; Agence pour le Développement Agricole (ADA); MAR/NIE/Agri/2013/1; US\$ 10,000,000)

9. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Not endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by Agence pour le Développement Agricole (ADA) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) Suggest that ADA reformulates the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) In addition to soil and water engineering efforts to reduce the vulnerability of the agricultural sector in Moroccan oases, the proponent should consider the development of alternative sources of incomes such as craft and tourism, as piloted with youth and women, to enhance the adaptive capacity of communities and reduce pressure on water resources;
  - (ii) The promotion of varieties of date palms that are resistant to the "Bayoud" virus, as specified in the text of the proposal, should be included in the project activities under component 2, and examples of species to be used for the biological control of siltation (under activity 2.2.2) should be provided;
  - (iii) The cost effectiveness of the project should be demonstrated more clearly, including information on the target areas, the size of farmer lands and number of beneficiaries;

- (iv) Existing technical standards for the building of dams, irrigation systems, or ground water use, should be provided. Any work that could trigger an environmental impact assessment (EIA) should be outlined, and the national laws on EIAs should be specified;
  - (v) Detailed information on ongoing agriculture/oasis-related initiatives by the government, multilateral or bilateral partners should be provided. Complementary adaptation and oasis-related projects in the country should also be described, and the “business as usual” or baseline activities provided, to demonstrate the added-value of the project and its adaptation reasoning;
  - (vi) A learning and knowledge management subcomponent should be added to the project. Activities described in the dedicated section in the document are not found in the description of the project’s activities and components;
  - (vii) It is not clear which stakeholders have been consulted. A list should be provided. Furthermore, existing local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil-society organizations (CSOs), as well as communities should be consulted, to increase coordination of actions on the ground and ensure sustainability;
  - (viii) The proponent should clarify which of the implementing entity fees or the execution costs are requested under “operating charges”; and
- (c) Request ADA to transmit the observations under sub-paragraph (b) to the Government of Morocco.

**(Decision B.22/7)**

*Concept Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities*

Indonesia: Adapting to climate change for improved food security in West Nusa Tenggara province (Project Concept; World Food Programme; IDN/MIE/Food/2013/1; US\$ 5,940,335)

10. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by World Food Programme (WFP) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) Request the secretariat to transmit to WFP the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The fully-developed project document should clearly explain how the proposed project would use its budget to finance concrete adaptation activities that produce visible and tangible results on the ground;

- (ii) The fully-developed project document should pay attention to the number of different proposed activities, and if necessary, focus the project further in order to ensure that it would be able to yield significant quantified benefits in all areas where activities are proposed.
- (c) Request WFP to transmit the observations under sub-paragraph (b) to the Government of Indonesia; and
- (d) Encourage the Government of Indonesia to submit through WFP a fully-developed project proposal that would address the observations under sub-paragraph (b).

**(Decision B.22/8)**

### **Fully-developed proposals**

#### *Fully-developed proposals from National Implementing Entities*

Benin: Adaptation of the Cotonou Lagoon ecosystems and human communities to sea level rise and extreme weather events impacts (Fully-developed project document; Fonds National pour l'Environnement (FNE); BEN/NIE/Coastal/2012/1; US\$ 8,913,255)

11. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- a) Not approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by Fonds National pour l'Environnement (FNE) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Suggest that FNE reformulates the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The proposal should provide technical details and engineering justification for the proposed reinforcement of the lagoon shores, relating it to the actual rate of erosion, and projected climate change impacts;
  - (ii) The proposal should provide technical details and engineering justification for the proposed rehabilitation of the dam across the lagoon, taking into account the coastal processes that influence functioning of the dam, and the effects of climate change on those processes;
  - (iii) The proposal should provide quantitative information on how the proposed activities would reduce the pressure on the lagoon ecosystem;
  - (iv) Substantial environmental and social impact assessments, including stakeholder consultations, should be carried out, and used to inform the revised proposal. Such studies should highlight the socio-economic impact of the suggested relocation of people inhabiting the lagoon shores to other

areas, and the replacement of livelihoods of current fishermen with other types of livelihoods, and the environmental impact of the proposed infrastructure in the short, medium and long term;

- (v) The proposal should explain how the proposed specific infrastructure would be consistent with the goals of spatial planning of the city, and how it would be linked to the specific city plans;
  - (vi) The proposal should further detail the type of support proposed to be provided through the project to naval forces;
  - (vii) The proposal should clarify the links with the World Bank financed waste management project, including which additional results related to waste management the proposed project is planned to yield; and
- (c) Request FNE to transmit the observations referred to under sub-paragraph (b) to the Government of Benin.

**(Decision B.22/9)**

Kenya: Integrated programme to build resilience to climate change and adaptive capacity of vulnerable communities in Kenya (Fully-developed programme document; National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA); KEN/NIE/Multi/2013/1; US\$ 9,999,558)

12. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- a) Not approve the programme document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Suggest that NEMA reformulates the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) Component 4 related to disaster risk reduction should be revised. As it currently reads, the link of the activities (through the use of green and energy saving technology to avoid deforestation) with disaster risk reduction and adaptation is very weak. The original proposal including early warning systems and flood control measures seemed more relevant;
  - (ii) Synergies and complementarities with existing initiatives listed under table 5 "On-going adaptation and mitigation projects in Kenya" should be outlined;
  - (iii) Budget notes should be more detailed, particularly for output 2.1., which is budgeted at US\$ 3,071,167, to outline costs such as consultants fees (person/day or person/week), contractual services, equipment (including vehicle), travel, and costs and expenses for communication materials;

- (iv) The implementation arrangements should be revised to account for the Adaptation Fund policies on execution costs (with the 9.5 per cent cap) and implementing entity fees (with the 8.5 per cent cap), to avoid administrative costs exceeding 18 per cent of the total programme budget; and
- c) Request NEMA to transmit the observations referred to in sub-paragraph (b) to the Government of Kenya.

**(Decision B.22/10)**

Rwanda: Reducing vulnerability to climate change in North West Rwanda through community based adaptation (Fully-developed project document; Ministry of Natural Resources (MINIRENA); RWA/NIE/Rural/2013/1; US\$ 9,969,619)

13. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- a) Approve the project document as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MINIRENA) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Approve the funding of US\$ 9,969,619 for the implementation of the project, as requested by MINIRENA; and
- c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with MINIRENA as the National Implementing Entity for the project.

**(Decision B.22/11)**

*Fully-developed proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)*

Nepal: Adapting to climate induced threats to food production and food security in the Karnali Region of Nepal (Fully-developed project document; World Food Programme; NPL/MIE/Food/2012/1; US\$ 9,527,160)

14. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Note the recommendation of the Adaptation Fund Board, subject to the availability of funds;
  - (i) Approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the World Food Programme (WFP) to the request made by the technical review;
  - (ii) Approve the funding of US\$ 9,527,160 for the implementation of the project, as requested by WFP;

- (iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with WFP as the Multilateral Implementing Entity for the project; and
- (b) Note that the project had been placed in the project/programme pipeline pursuant to Decision B.22/14.

**(Decision B.22/12)**

*Multiple layers of execution / implementation*

15. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), the Adaptation Fund Board decided to request the secretariat to examine the possible effects on administrative costs of the use of multiple Executing Entities and implementing partners to promote local development and execution of adaptation actions, and to report its findings to the fourteenth meeting of the PPRC.

**(Decision B.22/13)**

*Prioritization of projects in the pipeline*

16. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Note the recommendation of the PPRC to approve the project for Nepal (NPL/MIE/Food/2012/1) with a recommendation date of 10/31/2013, a submission date of 8/26/2013 and a net cost of US\$ 8,780,793;
- (b) Place the project mentioned in sub-paragraph (a) above in the pipeline according to the prioritization criteria established in Decision B.17/19 and clarified in Decision B.19/5; and
- (c) Consider the projects/programmes in the pipeline for approval, subject to the availability of funds, at a future Board meeting, or intersessionally, in the order in which they are prioritized in the pipeline in accordance with Decision B.20/7 (c).

**(Decision B.22/14)**

*Options for intersessional review of project and programme proposals*

17. After considering the conclusions and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- (a) Recognize the need for intersessional review of project and programme proposals by the secretariat and PPRC, and approval of proposals by the Board, in order that project and programme proponents continue to have the opportunity to present proposals at regular intervals; and

(b) Request the secretariat to prepare a revised options paper on the intersessional review and approval of project and programme proposals, including the process for such reviews and the types of proposals that could be reviewed intersessionally, for consideration by the PPRC at its fourteenth meeting.

**(Decision B.22/15)**

*Publication of the reports of the committees of the Board*

18. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the views expressed by the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) and agreed to place the reports of the PPRC and the Ethics and Finance Committee on the website of the Adaptation Fund starting with the reports considered at the twenty-third meeting of the Board.

**Agenda Item 7: Report of the thirteenth meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee**

*Annual performance report 2013*

19. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to approve the Adaptation Fund's Annual Performance Report FY 2013 contained in document AFB/EFC.13/3/Rev.1.

**(Decision B.22/16)**

*Results tracking*

20. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the work of the secretariat in the sphere of results tracking in compliance with Decision B.21/20.

*Financial issues*

*(a) Financial status of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund and CER monetization*

21. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the trustee's report.

*Reconciliation of the Board and secretariat, and trustee budgets for the fiscal year 2013.*

22. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the reconciled Board, secretariat, and trustee budgets for fiscal year 2013.

*Project Performance Reports approval*

*Georgia*

23. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

(a) Approve the second tranche of funds requested by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) for the implementation of the project *Developing Climate Resilient Flood and Flash Flood Management Practices to Protect Vulnerable Communities of Georgia* in the amount of US\$ 1,311,799; and

(b) Request the trustee to transfer to UNDP US\$ 1,311,799 as agreed to in the disbursement schedule included in the project agreement.

**(Decision B.22/17)**

#### *General discussion*

24. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided that once a project/programme proposal has been approved for funding, subsequent tranches of funding for it may be approved intersessionally on a non-objection basis, as per paragraph 56 of the rules of procedure.

**(Decision B.22/18)**

#### *Project extension request*

##### *Senegal*

25. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

(a) Grant an additional no-cost extension of 6 months requested by the Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE) for the project *Adaptation to coastal erosion in vulnerable areas in Senegal* in accordance with the Fund's project delays policy;

(b) Request the secretariat to undertake discussions with CSE in the context of an exit strategy under development with the involvement of national authorities and experts in Senegal, in order to obtain further information about:

- (i) Expected dates of completion with planned activities; and
- (ii) Details of technical and financial aspects causing the delay.

**(Decision B.22/19)**

#### *Complaint handling mechanism*

##### *Project A*

26. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to request the secretariat to issue a letter to the accredited implementing entities reminding them that all project/programme proposals must detail the implementation arrangements, including the identification of executing partners and

their role in the project/programme execution. Those arrangements should be discussed with the government and made fully transparent prior to project/programme approval. Any changes in implementation arrangements must remain under the 9.5 per cent cap set by the Board. The changes, reasons for the changes, and any associated risks must be reported to the secretariat as soon as possible.

**(Decision B.22/20)**

*Project B*

27. Having considered the comments and recommendations of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), the Adaptation Fund Board decided that the Accreditation Panel review the fiduciary standard on transparency, self-investigative powers, and anti-corruption measures, consistent with paragraph 37 of the operational policies and guidelines, of an accredited implementing entity for which a complaint was raised and report back to the EFC.

**(Decision B.22/21)**

**Agenda Item 8: Issues remaining from the twenty-first Board meeting**

a) *Strategic discussion on objectives and further steps of the Fund: report of the fundraising task-force*

28. The Adaptation Fund Board decided to take note of the fundraising strategy and to request the fundraising task force with support from the secretariat to continue to update the Board on fundraising efforts, including assessing options for sustainable financing of the Fund.

**(Decision B.22/22)**

b) *Environmental and social policy*

29. Following a discussion, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

(a) Approve:

- (i) The environmental and social policy contained in document AFB/B.22/5;
- (ii) The amendments to the operational policies and guidelines for Parties to access resources from the Adaptation Fund, its related templates, and instructions as contained in document AFB/B.22/5/Add.1;
- (iii) The tiered approach recommended by the secretariat to deal with already accredited implementing entities and applicants under review, as contained in document AFB/B.22/5/Add.2. The approach should include guidance or support to these entities for compliance with the environmental and social policy through the Fund's *Readiness Programme*, as outlined in document AFB/B.22/6, and report back to the Board;

- (iv) The amendments to the accreditation application contained in the annex to document AFB/B.22/5/Add.2; and

(b) Request the secretariat to communicate the approval of this decision to the accredited implementing entities.

**(Decision B.22/23)**

*c) Options for a readiness programme*

30. Following a discussion, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

- a) Approve Phase I of the *Readiness Programme* as detailed in document AFB/B.22/6, on the basis that it would follow performance-based funding principles;
- b) Take note of the options provided by the secretariat on a programme to support readiness for direct access to climate finance for national and regional implementing entities;
- c) Request the secretariat to submit to the Board intersessionally between the twenty-second and twenty-third meetings, execution arrangements, criteria/eligibility criteria to allocate the funds to the accredited implementing entities for specific activities, as well as a timeline of activities, with a view to start implementing the programme before the twenty-third Board meeting; and
- d) Approve an increase in the Administrative Budget of the Board, secretariat and trustee for FY2014 of US\$ 467,000 for the programme described in AFB/B.22/6, and authorize the trustee to transfer such amount to the secretariat and request the trustee to set aside the balance amount of US\$ 503,000 from the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund resources for subsequent commitment and transfer at the instruction of the Board.

**(Decision B.22/24)**

**Agenda Item 9: Communications and outreach**

31. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the presentation by the secretariat.

**Agenda Item 10: Financial Issues**

a) *Financial status of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund and Certified Emission Reduction (CER) monetization*

32. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the report by the trustee.

b) *Status of the project/programme pipeline*

33. The Adaptation Fund Board decided to continue deliberations at its twenty-third meeting on the implications of a number of options to fund the pipeline based on a document prepared

by the secretariat, including inputs provided by Board members and alternates during the intersessional period.

**(Decision B.22/25)**

**Agenda Item 11: Election of the Board, Project and Programme Review Committee, Ethics and Finance Committee and Accreditation Panel Chairs and Vice-Chairs**

34. Following a discussion the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

(a) Elect:

(i) Mr. Mamadou Honadia (Burkina Faso, Least Developed Countries) as Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board;

(ii) Ms. Su-Lin Garbett-Shiels (United Kingdom, Western Europe and other States) as Chair of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC);

(iii) Ms. Angela Churie-Kallhauge (Sweden, Annex I Parties) as Chair of the Accreditation Panel;

(iv) Mr. Philip S. Weech (Bahamas, Latin America and Caribbean States) as Vice-Chair of the Accreditation Panel; and

(b) Elect intersessionally, following the ninth session of the Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP9), the Vice-Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board, Vice-Chair of the EFC and the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Project and Programme Review Committee.

**(Decision B.22/26)**

**Agenda Item 12: Dates and venues of meetings in 2014**

35. Following the presentation by the Manager of the Adaptation Fund Board secretariat of possible meeting dates, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

(a) Confirm that its twenty-third meeting would be held from 18 to 21 March 2014 in Bonn, Germany; and

(b) Request the secretariat to present options intersessionally for dates and venues for the twenty-fourth meeting.

**(Decision B.22/27)**

**Agenda Item 13: Dialogue with civil society organizations**

36. The Adaptation Fund Board noted with appreciation the reports by the members of civil society.

**Agenda Item 14: Other matters**

*Activities at the ninth session of the Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP9)*

37. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the presentation by the secretariat.