



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/B.28/Inf.6
20 September 2016

Adaptation Fund Board
Twenty-eight meeting
Bonn, Germany, 7 October 2016

Agenda item 11

Management Response to the Evaluation of the Fund (Phase 1)

Introduction

1. At its eighteenth meeting (March 16, 2016) the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) of the Adaptation Fund (the Fund) Board (the Board) recommended that the Board include, in the agenda of its twenty-eighth meeting, an item on the pending recommendations arising out of the first phase of the overall evaluation of the Fund.
2. The Board subsequently decided, at its twenty-seventh meeting, "*to include, in the agenda of its twenty-eighth meeting, an item on the pending recommendations arising out of the first phase of the overall evaluation of the Adaptation Fund*" (Decision B.27/35).
3. The secretariat has developed the present informational document which includes the management response to the Evaluation of the Fund (Phase 1) and associated action plan.

Background

4. At its thirteenth meeting the Board approved an evaluation framework (AFB/EFC.4/5 – February 2011) for the Fund, discussed whether and when to undertake an overall evaluation for the Fund, and asked the secretariat and the GEF Evaluation Office to explore different options on who would be responsible for implementing the evaluation framework (Decision B.13/20).
5. At its twentieth meeting, the Board decided to request the secretariat to prepare a document for the twelfth meeting of the EFC to inform the discussion of the overall evaluation of the Fund, covering options for the terms of reference, cost, and timing of an overall evaluation, as well as options for commissioning the evaluation.
6. Document AFB/EFC.12/4 was prepared by the Evaluation Office (EO) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), in its capacity as interim evaluation function for the Fund (Decision B.15/23). This document included a schedule of expected mid-term and final evaluations of the projects/programmes from the portfolio, the implementation status of each project/programme, and the timing of an overall evaluation of the Fund. This document was presented at the EFC twelfth meeting (July 2013).
7. Based on the comments and recommendations of the EFC, the Board – at its twenty-first meeting (July 2013) requested the secretariat to prepare a second document (Decision B.21/17) containing:
 - a) Options for terms of reference for possible evaluations of the Fund covering different scopes;
 - b) A proposal regarding the timing of each option taking into account the status of the Fund's active portfolio;
 - c) Costs associated with each option; and
 - d) Options for commissioning the evaluation.
8. This second document (AFB/EFC.14/5 – February 2014) reviewed the main aspects of an evaluation, including options for a quality assurance process of the evaluation. It also provided an overview of guiding principles and best practices to implement this type of evaluation including the selection of evaluation teams and two options for selecting an evaluation team (request for proposals and request for tenders). The document identified 4 possible options to conduct an overall evaluation of the Fund, whit strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and threats for each one and an estimated budget:
 - a) **Option 1: Process Evaluation.** It would focus on project, programme, and policy implementation and improvements, and evaluate the internal dynamics of the funding institution paying special attention to the Fund's flagship processes – accreditation process, direct access modality, transparency, governance, etc.

- b) **Option 2: Limited Overall Evaluation.** Considering limitations posed by its young portfolio, a limited overall evaluation would include process and performance evaluation of the internal dynamics of the funding institution as well as outcome evaluation of interventions where possible.
- c) **Option 3: Two-phased Evaluation.** Phase 1 would focus on a process/performance evaluation (similar to option 1 above) and Phase 2 would focus on an evaluation of the portfolio including long term outcomes, impacts and sustainability of the Fund's interventions.
- d) **Option 4: Delayed Overall Evaluation.** Delay the overall / comprehensive evaluation until the portfolio reaches maturity. It would then assess progress towards the Fund's objectives, the major achievement and lessons from the Fund's implementation and formulate recommendations for potential improvement.

9. This document was reviewed by the Board at its twenty-third meeting (March 2014). Following discussion on the four options presented in the document, the Board approved option 3 (Two-phased Evaluation) as identified in the document (AFB/EFC.14/5), as well as a request for EFC to propose an Independent Review Panel (IRP) consisting of three members (i) an evaluation specialist (ii) an adaptation specialist and (iii) a representative from civil society (Decision B. 23/18). Responsibilities of the IRP were detailed in TORs; they included the review of the final TOR for the evaluation - which was to include elements of the scope of Decision 2/CMP.9 for the second review of the Fund¹ - select the evaluation team and provide quality assurance during the evaluation process.

10. The Board decided to appoint Ms. Eva Lithman, Mr. Simon Anderson, and Dr. Doreen Stabinsky to an independent review panel (IRP) for the Fund's overall evaluation through an inter-sessional decision of the Board (Decision B.23-24/4 – May 2014).

11. The TORs for Phase 1 of the Evaluation of the Fund were drafted by the secretariat, reviewed by the IRP, and submitted to the Board for its approval. The TORs were approved through an inter-sessional decision of the Board (Decision B.23-24/10 – July 2014).

12. A consortium - Tango International and the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) - was recruited to conduct the Phase 1 evaluation of the Fund. An inception report summarized the inception phase of this exercise and was submitted to the secretariat in November 2014. It presented the approach to be used to conduct this phase 1 evaluation, which was aligned with the TORs. It included an evaluation matrix which defined the detailed scope of work for this phase 1 evaluation.

13. Preliminary findings were presented by the Lead Evaluator at the sixteenth EFC meeting on April 8, 2015. The final report of the Phase 1 evaluation was completed in August 2015. This report was reviewed by the EFC at its seventeenth meeting (October 2015) and based on the recommendations from the EFC, the Board – at its twenty-sixth meeting (October 2015) - requested the secretariat to prepare a management response to the Evaluation of the Fund (stage I) and to prepare options for conducting phase 2 of the

¹ The Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP) decided to undertake a second review of the Fund in accordance with the TOR contained in the annex to Decision 2/CMP.9. The objective of this second review is to ensure the effectiveness, sustainability and adequacy of the operation of the Fund, with a view to the CMP adopting an appropriate decision on this matter at CMP 10. The scope of the second review of the Fund will cover the progress made to date and lessons learned in the operationalization and implementation of the Fund, and will focus on, inter alia:

- a) The provision of sustainable, predictable and adequate financial resources, including the potential diversification of revenue streams, to fund concrete adaptation projects and programmes that are country driven and based on the needs, views and priorities of eligible Parties;
- b) Lessons learned from the application of the access modalities of the Fund;
- c) The institutional linkages and relations, as appropriate, between the Fund and other institutions, in particular institutions under the Convention;
- d) The institutional arrangements for the Fund, in particular the arrangements with the interim secretariat and the interim trustee.

evaluation (Decision B. 26/30).

14. A management response to the first phase of the overall evaluation of the Fund and action plan has been approved intersessionally by the Board (Decision B.26-27/26). It is included in this in Annex I.

Annex I – Management response to the Evaluation of the Fund (Phase 1) and action plan

Evaluation recommendation	Management response to the recommendation	Actions to be taken	Body in charge of action	Timeframe
Relevance				
<p><i>Recommendation 1:</i> Review the experience of other funds to identify good practices to strengthen vulnerability targeting and formulate clear guidance for Adaptation Fund applicants. In particular, the IET recommends exploring the convening of an expert panel to suggest specific criteria for selecting regions, countries and social groups; and to assist the AFB in the region and country selection process. It is not satisfactory to speak only in terms of “vulnerable communities” since climate hazards do not equally affect all people within a community, or even the same household. Indeed, the inequitable distribution of rights, resources, and power constrains many people’s ability to take action on climate change, especially women.</p>	<p>This recommendation has been already partly addressed through the “<i>Analysis of climate change adaptation reasoning in project and programme proposals approved by the Board</i>” that the Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) requested at its 25th meeting (AFB 25), and approved in December 2015 (B. 26-27/3). This study highlights that the mandate of the Fund to finance concrete adaptation activities is not being done at the expense of the considerations of the drivers of vulnerability, and that the results framework (and projects outputs) encompasses the vulnerability aspects. It also outlines that projects are typically concerned with reducing vulnerability through securing assets that underpin livelihoods. The AFB requested that the AFB Secretariat produce a shortened and simplified</p>	<p>In order to build upon this study, the AFB has requested (Decision B.26/27) the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) “to consider further study as recommended in document AFB/PPRC.17/5, in order to deepen the analysis of climate change adaptation reasoning in projects and programmes of the Adaptation Fund at the 19th meeting of the PPRC”. The PPRC will discuss this matter at its 19th meeting, and may recommend the AFB to take an appropriate decision at its 28th meeting.</p> <p>The AFB decided to request the AFB Secretariat to “<i>Promote the report including through events and</i></p>	<p>AFB, PPRC and AFB Secretariat</p> <p>AFB and AFB Secretariat</p>	<p>19th meeting of the PPRC (4/5 October 2016); and 28th meeting of the AFB (6/7 October 2016)</p> <p>Ongoing</p>

	<p>version of the report and that has been made available online. In addition, the AFB requested the AFB Secretariat to promote the report through events and engagement with relevant institutions.</p> <p>The option of convening an expert panel to suggest specific criteria for selecting regions or countries does not seem to be aligned with the Adaptation Fund (AF) mandate that is to focus on Non-Annex 1 Parties to the Kyoto protocol, regardless of any other criteria. Consideration of social groups within a country, is already to a significant degree addressed by the AF Environmental and Social Policy that has specific principles related to social vulnerability, e.g. Principle 2 “Access and Equity”, 3 “Marginalized and vulnerable groups”, 5 “Gender equity and Women’s empowerment”, and 7 “Indigenous peoples”.</p> <p>Gender considerations were explicitly included in the</p>	<p><i>through engagement with relevant institutions and through bodies under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change” (Decision B.26/27).</i></p> <p>The AFB through the AFB Secretariat will continue collaborating with academia and Adaptation Committee to ensure that AF review criteria, in particular related to targeting the most vulnerable, are relevant.</p> <p>As requested by the AFB (decision B.26/32), the</p>	<p>AFB and AFB Secretariat</p> <p>AFB, EFC and AFB Secretariat</p>	<p>Ongoing (Adaptation Committee in March 2016, Adaptation Futures in May 2016)</p> <p>18th meeting (15/16 March 2016) of the EFC,</p>
--	--	---	--	---

	<p>project review criteria early on in the Fund's operations in 2011, with specific references to gender in review criteria on economic, social and environmental benefits, the consultation process, and monitoring and evaluation. As mentioned above, gender was included as a separate principle in the Environmental and Social Policy that was approved in 2013. Most recently, the AFB has approved (B.26/32) a draft gender policy and requested the AFB Secretariat to present at AFB27 a revised proposal for the gender policy and associated action plan to operationalize this policy. The policy holds at its core the concept of gender equality that addresses the recommendation to ensure an equitable distribution of adaptation benefits.</p> <p>Related to the suggested selection of social groups, it is also worth mentioning that while the AFB may assign priority focus to certain social groups based on their vulnerability globally, it would</p>	<p>AFB Secretariat will prepare, for consideration at the 27th meeting of the AFB :”i) A revised proposal for an Adaptation Fund gender policy incorporating the inputs received from Board members and interested stakeholders through the public call for comments; ii) An action plan to operationalize an Adaptation Fund gender policy, including any necessary changes to the relevant Adaptation Fund policies; iii) A compilation of the comments received through the public call for comments; and iv) An estimate of the costs related to operationalizing the policy”. The Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) of the AFB will discuss such matter and may recommend the AFB to take a decision at its 27th meeting.</p> <p>Upon finalization of the gender policy, the AFB</p>	<p>AFB and AFB Secretariat</p>	<p>and 27th meeting of the AFB (17/18 March 2016).</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
--	---	--	--------------------------------	--

	be complicated to do so specifically within a given region or country, without risking encroaching on countries' sovereignty.	through the AFB secretariat will continue disseminating information on the various relevant policies addressing the specific needs of most vulnerable communities and their constituents.		
Effectiveness				
<p><i>Recommendation 2:</i> Recruit additional senior secretariat staff to address the capacity constraints to undertake effective knowledge management and resource mobilization. Short-term consultants should not fill these roles.</p>	<p>The AFB emphasizes the need to ensure an effective operation of the Fund which includes monitoring the AFB Secretariat workload and its staffing requirements. Ensure cost effective operations is a key role of the Board. To this respect, the AFB decided, at its 25th meeting, to approve the Board and Secretariat and trustee budget for the fiscal year 2016. Such budget included one additional senior staff at the AFB Secretariat. This new staff has been recruited and is now fully operational.</p> <p>Moreover, responsibilities related to Knowledge Management and Resource Mobilization within the AFB Secretariat have been clarified. In addition, an</p>	<p>The AFB will continue monitoring the workload and staff needs of the AFB Secretariat and will ensure that the hiring of short term consultants are minimized, to the extent possible.</p> <p>The AFB will ensure that appropriate resources are allocated to the implementation of the KM strategy and action plan. In addition, the</p>	<p>AFB</p> <p>AFB, EFC, and AFB Secretariat</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>The implementation of the current KM strategy ongoing. An updated knowledge management strategy and action plan to be discussed at the</p>

	updated Knowledge Management strategy and associated action plan is being drafted by the AFB Secretariat and will be presented to the AFB at its 28 th meeting.	EFC will discuss at its 19 th meeting an updated knowledge management strategy and action plan prepared by the AFB Secretariat, and may recommend the AFB to take a decision at its 28 th meeting.		19 th meeting of the EFC and 28 th meeting of the AFB (4-7 October 2016)
<i>Recommendation 3:</i> Continue to improve the accreditation process, with specific focus on early identification of fiduciary risks. Divide the accreditation process into phases, including an initial screening to catch red flags that would prevent accreditation. This will save substantial time and money. The screening could draw upon readily available materials including, where extant, fiduciary assessments undertaken by bilateral agencies and charitable foundations, and from the due diligence processes of public and private banks	This recommendation is currently being addressed. Indeed, the AFB has decided to request the Accreditation Panel (AP) and the AFB Secretariat to consider the relevant findings of the Evaluation of the Fund (stage 1) and finalize their work and present a draft for consideration by the EFC at its 18 th meeting. This “Effectiveness and efficiency of the accreditation process” document establishes a clear timeline for accreditation workflow (Annex I to AFB/EFC18/4) and divides the accreditation process into phases with a clear timeline. In addition, once the AFB approve such document, a guidance document for accreditation application (Annex II to AFB/EFC18/4) will be available on the AF	The AP and the AFB Secretariat will present a draft effectiveness and efficiency document at the 18 th meeting of the EFC. Based on these discussions, the EFC may recommend the AFB to take a decision at its 27 th meeting.	AFB, EFC, AP, and AFB Secretariat	18 th meeting of the EFC (15/16 March 2016)

	<p>website.</p> <p>As part of the continuous enhancement of the efficiency of the accreditation processes, the AP and AFB Secretariat will consider to establish a checklist for screening of accreditation application.</p>	<p>The AFB through the AP and the AFB Secretariat will consider to establish a checklist for screening of accreditation application. The AP may recommend the AFB to take any decision on this matter, if appropriate.</p>	<p>AFB, AP and AFB Secretariat</p>	<p>To Be Determined</p>
<p><i>Recommendation 4:</i> Strengthen the policy and guidelines for an inclusive and transparent selection of NIEs. This will help the Adaptation Fund to minimize risk of corruption related to Designated Authorities' decision-making authority to choose which institutions apply to become NIEs. The IET recommends reviewing lessons learned from country-coordinating mechanisms in other funds.</p>	<p>This recommendation could potentially be addressed through an enhancement of guidelines for entities seeking accreditation. However, country ownership is an essential strategic priority of the Fund and the identification of applicant NIEs should remain a prerogative of the country.</p>	<p>The AFB through the AP and the AFB Secretariat will continue reviewing and updating guidelines for entities seeking accreditation, emphasizing on lessons learned.</p>	<p>AFB, AP, and AFB Secretariat</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p><i>Recommendation 5:</i> Develop and implement a comprehensive gender policy based on a review of other funds' gender policies. In particular, the IET recommends GCF's Gender Policy and Action Plan, which is illustrative of many best</p>	<p>This recommendation is already being addressed. The AFB has welcomed a draft gender policy at its 26th meeting, and has requested the AFB Secretariat to prepare a revised policy and associated documents for presentation at the 27th</p>	<p>As requested by the AFB (decision B.26/32), the AFB Secretariat will prepare, for consideration at the 27th meeting of the AFB :") A revised proposal for an Adaptation Fund gender policy incorporating the</p>	<p>AFB, EFC and AFB Secretariat</p>	<p>18th meeting (15/16 March 2016) of the EFC, and 27th meeting of the AFB (17/18 March 2016).</p>

<p>practices, including the assignment of specific responsibilities (e.g. to its Board, Secretariat, DAs, as well as implementing and executing agencies).</p>	<p>meeting of the AFB.</p>	<p><i>inputs received from Board members and interested stakeholders through the public call for comments; ii) An action plan to operationalize an Adaptation Fund gender policy, including any necessary changes to the relevant Adaptation Fund policies; iii) A compilation of the comments received through the public call for comments; and iv) An estimate of the costs related to operationalizing the policy</i>. The EFC will discuss such matter and may recommend the AFB to take a decision at its 27th meeting.</p>		
<p><i>Recommendation 6:</i> Review the experience of other funds to identify good practices in organizational performance monitoring. In particular, the IET recommends exploring more established funds beyond climate finance to identify appropriate key performance indicators. At present, the Adaptation Fund only utilizes a results-based</p>	<p>This recommendation is already addressed through the Annual Performance Report (APR) presented to the AF Board on a yearly basis. Such report includes an analysis of project approvals to date, an elapsed time analysis, the expected results from approved projects, a summary of progress made for projects under</p>	<p>The AFB may instruct the AFB Secretariat to review the current framework, explore practices from other funds, including funds beyond the climate finance sector, identify any gaps in its monitoring framework, and update it accordingly.</p>	<p>AFB, EFC, AP, AFB Secretariat</p>	<p>By end of calendar year 2016</p>

<p>framework for monitoring of project/program effectiveness. There is no framework to track effectiveness of the main organizational processes; this contributed to the existence and persistence of the resource and policy gaps identified through this evaluation.</p>	<p>implementation, and a presentation of the management effectiveness and efficiency indicators for the Fund. Such key performance indicators includes indicators related to increased and diversified resources, efficient cost structure, project cycle efficiency, results driven implementation and increased and diversified access modalities. Nevertheless, the AFB takes note of the recommendation and may request the AFB Secretariat to take further actions on this topic.</p>			
<p>Efficiency</p>				
<p><i>Recommendation 7:</i> Delegate approval of project/program proposals to the AFB's dedicated Secretariat. Further layers of review add little technical or other value. In addition, the IET recommends reviewing lessons learned by other funds with regards to the delegation of decision-making authority.</p>	<p>As a core mission of its mandate, the AFB continuously discusses how the performance of the Fund can be improved, including possible delegations of authority, number of meetings, and mandate of the committees, among others. The Evaluation of the Fund stage 1 outlines that the Fund is a learning institution, highlighting that the AFB acts when needed. The AFB takes note of this recommendation,</p>	<p>The AFB may include this topic in its further deliberations, if it deems appropriate.</p>	<p>AFB</p>	<p>To Be Determined</p>

	and will include it in its further deliberations.			
<i>Recommendation 8:</i> Delegate more approval and other decision-making responsibilities to committees and panels, especially the EFC and Accreditation Panel, subject to strategic guidance provided by the AFB.	The AFB is in the view that this recommendation does not appear very practical, considering the relative high level of efficiency of the AP, that is being further strengthened with the proposed effectiveness and efficiency document to be presented at AFB 27, and the fact that the EFC and PPRC committees meet back-to-back with the AFB, and are composed by AFB members.	The AFB may include this topic in its further deliberations, if it deems appropriate.	AFB	To Be Determined
<i>Recommendation 9:</i> In light of the Trustee's possible change to a fee-based approach, undertake a study to assess whether the World Bank will continue to provide the best value added or whether another entity could provide the necessary services at a lower cost. The AFB was recently mandated by CMP to consider an open and competitive bidding process for Trustee services.	By Decision 1/CMP 10, it was indeed requested that the AFB " <i>continue its work on options for permanent institutional arrangements for the secretariat and the trustee, including via an open and competitive bidding process for the selection of a permanent trustee for the Adaptation Fund on the basis of the cost and time frame of each option and its legal and financial implications in order to ensure there is no discontinuity of the trustee service</i> ". Institutional arrangements are a central objective in the AFB mission.	The AFB may include this topic in its further deliberations. Should the trustee changes its approach, the AFB may request the AFB Secretariat to undertake such study.	AFB, Trustee	To Be Determined

	As a result, the AFB takes note of this recommendation. Should the trustee indeed confirm its intention to change to a fee-based approach, this recommendation would be taken into account.			
<i>Recommendation 10:</i> Adopt a more consistent and less discretionary approach to closed meetings, and revise the rules to select active observers (e.g., allow Adaptation Fund accredited CSOs to vote on Adaptation Fund-accredited candidates) and allow active observers to comment during AFB meetings and committee meetings (e.g. at the end of each agenda point, upon invitation from the Chair/Co-Chair). The AFB should also develop term limits and rules and responsibilities, especially around conflict of interest and types of information that can and cannot be shared outside of meetings.	The AFB takes note of this recommendation and acknowledges the need to improve Civil Society Organizations involvement as a core part of its continuous dialogue with stakeholders. The AFB discusses regularly how to further improve transparency of its processes and participation of observers and CSOs.	The AFB may include this topic in its further deliberations.	AFB	To Be Determined
Sustainability				
<i>Recommendation 11:</i> Organize a joint review with the GCF to explore the best modality for the Adaptation	This recommendation is already being addressed. The AFB has formally initiated discussions on such topic at	The AFB will include such topic in its deliberations.	AFB	Ongoing

<p>Fund to access a reliable stream of funding from the GCF. The AFB will need to continue working to highlight its strengths and experience in funding concrete adaptation projects and lobby stakeholders for support to link with GCF.</p>	<p>AFB 25.</p> <p>In addition, as part of the enhancement of its internal processes, the AFB Secretariat is currently reviewing its Knowledge Management strategy, in order to further optimize capture of knowledge and lessons learned across its portfolio. It will present this updated strategy at the 19th meeting of the EFC.</p> <p>Moreover, as stated under recommendation 1, the AFB has undertaken an “<i>Analysis of climate change adaptation reasoning in project and programme proposals approved by the Board</i>” that outlines its experience in funding concrete adaptation projects.</p> <p>Finally, it is worth noting that in its decision 7/CP.21 related to the Standing Committee on Finance report, the COP “<i>Encourages the Board of the Green Climate Fund to improve complementarity and coherence with other institutions, per paragraphs</i></p>	<p>The EFC will discuss at its 19th meeting an updated knowledge management strategy and action plan prepared by the AFB Secretariat, and may recommend the AFB to take a decision at its 28th meeting.</p>	<p>AFB, EFC and AFB Secretariat</p>	<p>The implementation of the current KM strategy ongoing. An updated knowledge management strategy and action plan to be discussed at the 19th meeting of the EFC and 28th meeting of the AFB (4-7 October 2016).</p>
---	---	---	-------------------------------------	---

	<p><i>33 and 34 of the governing instrument of the Green Climate Fund, including by engaging with relevant bodies of the Convention, such as the Standing Committee on Finance.”</i></p>			
<p><i>Recommendation 12:</i> Develop and implement a robust, multi-year resource mobilization strategy that specifies regular trust replenishment periods. This strategy must include best-case scenarios, e.g., strategic relationships with GCF and other climate funds, and a worst-case scenario based on increased competition among climate funds. Development of the strategy goes hand in hand with contracting full-time senior secretariat staff with fundraising experience and expertise.</p>	<p>The AFB takes note of this recommendation. Nevertheless, it seems important to recall that the AF has been designed with the idea that it would be financed mostly by a levy of the Clean Development Mechanisms. On another note, the COP has ongoing discussions on improving the effectiveness of the climate finance architecture (e.g. decisions 1/CP.21, para 59: [The Conference of Parties] <i>“Recognizes that the Adaptation Fund may serve the Agreement, subject to relevant decisions by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement”</i>, para 60 <i>“Invites the Conference of the Parties serving as the</i></p>	<p>The AFB may provide inputs on this topic in its report to CMP12.</p>	<p>AFB</p>	<p>By CMP12</p>

	<p><i>meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol to consider the issue referred to in paragraph 59 above and make a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement at its first session”., 1/CMP.11, para 8. [The Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol] “Recommends that the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement, at its first session, consider that the Adaptation Fund may serve the Paris Agreement, in accordance with paragraphs 60 and 61 of decision 1/CP.21;” and 9 :”Invites the Conference of the Parties, at its twenty-second session (November 2016), to request the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Paris Agreement to undertake the necessary preparatory work concerning the issue referred to in paragraph 8 above and to forward a recommendation to the Conference of the Parties serving as the</i></p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p><i>meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol for its consideration and adoption no later than at its fifteenth session (November 2019)”.</i></p> <p>Moreover, it is worth noting that the COP, in its decision 7/CP.21 “<i>Encourages the Board of the Green Climate Fund to improve complementarity and coherence with other institutions, per paragraphs 33 and 34 of the governing instrument of the Green Climate Fund, including by engaging with relevant bodies of the Convention, such as the Standing Committee on Finance</i>” (para 26).</p> <p>Finally, the AFB has set-up a Resource Mobilization Task Force that is currently supported by the AFB Secretariat in updating the Resource Mobilization Strategy of the Fund, which will include the elements mentioned in the recommendation.</p>	<p>Update the Resource Mobilization Strategy</p>	<p>Resource Mobilization Task Force of the AFB, supported by the AFB secretariat.</p>	<p>By the 28th meeting of the AFB (4-7 October 2016)</p>
--	---	--	---	---

<p><i>Recommendation 13:</i> Designate the current AFB member seat on the PPCR governing body for the AFB Secretariat. This would be the first step in collaborating more closely with the CIF Secretariat to explore ways to achieve greater functional synergies.</p>	<p>The AFB Secretariat has been attending the PPCR meetings regularly as observer. Indeed, a rule of the PPCR is that one of its sub-committee members will be “the developing country Chair or Vice-Chair of the Board of the Adaptation Fund (AFB) (or any other member of the AFB nominated by him or her)”.</p> <p>The AFB may consider requesting its Non-Annex I Chair or Vice-Chair to attend the PPCR meetings, or to nominate another Non-Annex I Party Board member to represent him or her.</p>	<p>The AFB may consider requesting its Non-Annex I Chair or Vice-Chair to attend the PPCR meetings, or to nominate another Non-Annex I Party Board member to represent him or her</p>	<p>AFB Non-Annex I Chair/Vice-Chair and AFB</p>	<p>To Be Determined.</p>
---	--	---	---	--------------------------