



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/B.30/11
13 October 2017

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

Thirtieth Meeting

Bonn, Germany, 12-13 October 2017

DECISIONS OF THE THIRTIETH MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

Agenda Item 5: Report of the Accreditation Panel

1. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided to request the secretariat, in collaboration with the Accreditation Panel:

(a) To reflect on the re-accreditation process in order to identify any need for updates or clarifications at the twenty-seventh meeting of the Accreditation Panel; and

(b) To present to the Board at its thirty-first meeting, the conclusions of the Accreditation Panel's discussions on paragraph (a) and, if necessary, an update of the re-accreditation process adopted by decision B.22/3.

(Decision B.30/1)

2. The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided to request the secretariat:

(a) To reflect on the accreditation experience of the Adaptation Fund; and

(b) To prepare, in collaboration with the Accreditation Panel, a report on the experience gained and lessons learned, including an overview of guidance on accreditation, for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting.

(Decision B.30/2)

Completed case

National Environment Management Council (NEMC)

3. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to accredit the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) of Tanzania as a National Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund.

(Decision B.30/3)

Agenda Item 6: Report of twenty-first meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee

(c) Project/programme proposals

Single-country projects and programmes

Concept proposals

Proposals from National Implementing Entities (NIEs)

Small-size proposals:

Indonesia (1): Build and strengthen resilience of coastal community against climate change impacts by Perempuan Inspirasi Perubahan Pesisir (PINISI) or Women Inspiration for Coastal Change in Bulukumba District (Project concept; Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan); IDN/NIE/Coastal/2017/1; \$998,878)

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

(a) To not endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;

(b) To suggest that Kemitraan reformulate 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 strengthen project justification in terms of providing more information on the occurring or expected climate change effects in the region;

(ii) The proposal should provide a higher level of detail regarding the concrete activities and tangible results that will be delivered and further demonstrate that the activities address the climate change threats described;

(iii) The proposal should strengthen the coherence and cohesion of the project components, outcomes and outputs;

(iv) The proposal should justify and further explain the sub-grant financing structure;

(v) The proposal should include information on the expected beneficiaries of the project;

(vi) The proposal should clarify the overview of environmental and social risks and state the category in which the screening process has classified the project;

- (c) To not approve the project formulation grant of \$30,000; and
- (d) To request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Indonesia.

(Decision B.30/4)

Indonesia (2): Community Adaptation for Forest-Food Based Management in Saddang Watershed Ecosystem (Project concept; Kemitraan; IDN/NIE/Food/2017/1; \$905,109)

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

- (a) To endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to transmit to Kemitraan 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 further strengthen the consultative processes; involving all key stakeholders and vulnerable groups and including gender considerations in compliance with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy and gender policy need to be done during project's design phase. A description of the consultation process, specifying groups considered and consultation outcomes, should be provided;
 - (ii) At the fully-developed project document stage, compliance of the identified project environmental and social impacts/risks with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy and gender policy has to be better explained, specifically for activities requiring physical interventions under output 1.3.2;
 - (iii) The concept of "social forestry scheme" should be better explained;
 - (iv) The impact of the proposed coastal management on the areas being targeted should be further detailed;
 - (v) Since the identified project targeted area comprises four districts, a more detailed description of the institutional arrangements that will be put in place should be provided;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of \$30,000;
- (d) To request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of the Indonesia; and
- (e) To encourage the Government of Indonesia to submit through Kemitraan a fully-developed project proposal that would address the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.30/5)

Indonesia (3): Developing Community Resilience to Adapt to Climate Change in Maratua (Project concept; Kemitraan; IDN/NIE/DRR/2017/1; \$946,287)

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

- (a) To not endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that Kemitraan reformulate the proposal considering 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 further explain or demonstrate the adaptation benefits of the project's expected outcomes, providing more detail and clarity on those expected outcomes;
 - (ii) The proposal could simplify the project structure, reducing the number of components to facilitate better articulation among project outcomes;
 - (iii) The mechanism envisaged to share lessons learned and know-how with other communities should be described more in detail;
 - (iv) The proposal should clearly identify the environmental and social risks associated with this project, given its high potential impact, including through the construction of a reservoir, the disruption of stream flow, fishery activities with their associated pollution, and the construction of aquaculture cages and a water storage pond that will both provide drinking water and feed an 'ice cube factory';
- (c) To not approve the project formulation grant of \$30,000; and
- (d) To request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Indonesia.

(Decision B.30/6)

Indonesia (4): Development of Sustainable Seaweed and Fishery Management for Enhance Community Prosperity; Climate Change Adaptation of Coastal and Small Island at Nusa Tenggara Barat Province (Project concept; Kemitraan; IDN/NIE/Multi/2017/2; \$990,000)

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

- (a) To not endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;

- (b) To suggest that Kemitraan reformulate the proposal considering 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 have a clearer adaptation rationale that defines the impacts of climate change that the project has been designed to address;
 - (ii) The proposal should strengthen knowledge management and outreach activities. It should also consider including activities, such as an online presence/repository of lessons learned, production of outreach material, both in printed format and using available electronic platforms. Furthermore, what the strategy is to various relevant audiences active in the outreach campaign should be further elaborated;
 - (iii) The proposal should further describe the local context of the project site, review other investments/projects in the project area, and strengthen the justification of how the project is cost-effective and appropriate for increasing the resilience of vulnerable populations;
- (c) To not approve the project formulation grant of \$30,000; and
- (d) To request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Indonesia.

(Decision B.30/7)

Indonesia (5): The adaptation measures to support sustainable livelihoods for local communities in mangrove ecosystem in the Mahakam Delta, East Kalimantan (Project concept; Kemitraan; IDN/NIE/Food/2017/2; \$589,975)

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

- (a) To not endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that Kemitraan reformulate the proposal considering the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
 - (i) All updated information in response to the previous technical review should be included in the project document, such as the mechanism for seedling services and how benefits related to non-mangrove products will be distributed in a gender-sensitive manner and involving the most vulnerable groups to ensure there is no 'dis-adoption' of envisaged initiatives;
 - (ii) The proposal should provide information and lessons learned on the mangrove rehabilitation program that have informed the design of the proposed project;
 - (iii) The proposal should provide more clarity on the concept of silvofishery;

- (iv) The proposal should include the cost justification for the project, and clarify the project's sustainability by explaining the replicability and scalability of the envisaged adaptation activities and benefits of the project;
- (v) The proposal should ensure that the environmental and social risks associated with the proposed activities have been adequately identified, and that the risk findings in the concept note have been substantiated;
- (c) To not approve the project formulation grant of \$30,000; and
- (d) To request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Indonesia.

(Decision B.30/8)

Indonesia (6): Improving community's resilience and government policy response for climate change adaptation in West Papua Province of Indonesia (Project concept; Kemitraan; IDN/NIE/Rural/2017/1; \$1,000,000)

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

- (a) To not endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that Kemitraan reformulate the proposal considering 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 be more explicit on the tangible adaptation measures to address climate threats/risks in the agriculture and fisheries sectors at the village level. Such measures should represent a greater portion of the budget;
 - (ii) The proposed knowledge management and learning approach for the project should be reflected in the project's activities;
 - (iii) The consultation process should be further demonstrated, including the results of the consultation meeting;
 - (iv) The concept document should provide an adequate explanation of how the sustainability of the project outcomes has been taken into account in the project design;
 - (v) The identification process of the environmental and social impacts/risks and overall compliance with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy and gender policy should be better explained, and the project should be categorized accordingly;
- (c) To not approve the project formulation grant of \$30,000; and

- (d) To request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Indonesia.

(Decision B.30/9)

Regular proposals:

Armenia (1): Artik city closed stone pit wastes and flood management pilot project (Project concept; Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU) of the Ministry of Nature Protection of Armenia; ARM/NIE/Urban/2017/1; \$1,435,100)

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

- (a) To endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU) of the Ministry of Nature Protection of Armenia to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to transmit to EPIU the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
- (i) The project proposal should link the existing or projected climate threats with the envisaged interventions. It is not clear what the slope stabilization measures, including their scope of intervention, the construction of an irrigation water system for further maintenance of the landscape, or landscape design for the creation of a recreational area, would help address;
 - (ii) The proposal should clarify the expected impact of the interventions on the 300 hectares of arable land, 190 hectares of pastures, 15 hectares of hay meadows, 640 hectares of artificial forests, 80 hectares of water reservoir and other natural landscapes in the project impact area;
 - (iii) The fully-developed project document should demonstrate that the sustainability of this component's outcomes will be ensured by the city through its budget, including through innovative funding mechanisms such as the development of, or involvement in, a flood index insurance scheme;
 - (iv) The fully-developed project document should also include a comprehensive vulnerability assessment specifying the areas that would be most affected by flood events and identifying the most vulnerable communities;
 - (v) The fully-developed project document should expand on the socio-economic benefits expected from this project, including the expected number of beneficiaries, both direct and indirect, with an emphasis on the most vulnerable groups and gender considerations;
 - (vi) The adequacy of the consultative process should be demonstrated, including by providing the minutes or reports of the consultation sessions, including the names, gender and titles of the people consulted;

- (vii) The fully-developed project document should explore the establishment of a flood early-warning system for the city of Artik;
 - (viii) The fully-developed project document should clarify how a risk management system will be established through this project;
 - (ix) In compliance with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy, the risk screening exercise should be improved and the categorization of the project better justified;
 - (x) The fully-developed project document should provide an analysis of compliance with the Adaptation Fund's gender policy;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of \$27,000;
 - (d) To request EPIU to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Armenia; and
 - (e) To encourage the Government of Armenia to submit through EPIU a fully-developed project proposal that would address the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.30/10)

Armenia (2): Sustainable management of adjacent ecosystems of specially protected nature areas of the RA and capacity building in communities (Project concept; Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU) of the Ministry of Nature Protection of Armenia; ARM/NIE/Forest/2017/1; \$2,506,000)

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

- a) To not endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU) of the Ministry of Nature Protection of Armenia to the request made by the technical review;
- b) To suggest that EPIU reformulate 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 identify concrete outputs related to the project activities identified under Part II, Section A. In addressing this issue, the proposal should use consistent language in the title of the project components, should demonstrate how the proposed project activities deviate from business-as-usual, how they address past, observed or expected climate change, and how the installation of modern energy saving technologies will contribute to building climate resilience in the project area;
 - (ii) The proposal should provide an explanation of the proposed project scope and approach and identify an alternative approach that could achieve the same results;

- (iii) Taking into consideration subparagraph (i) above, the proposal should provide further clarification regarding the conclusions reached following environmental and social risk screening;
- (iv) Taking into consideration subparagraph (i) above, the project should determine any potential additional economic, social and environmental benefits;
- (c) To not approve the project formulation grant of \$30,000; and
- (d) To request EPIU to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Armenia.

(Decision B.30/11)

Indonesia (7): Building Coastal City Resilience to Climate Change Impacts and Natural Disasters in Pekalongan City, Central Java Province (Project concept; Kemitraan; IDN/NIE/Multi/2017/1; \$4,169,987)

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

- (a) To endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to transmit to Kemitraan the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
 - (i) The sustainability of project outcomes needs to be better articulated, by embedding the planned activities in the village- and city-level governance structures (government, private sector and civil society organizations) so they can be scaled up and/or maintained (coastal embankment) with appropriate financing;
 - (ii) The relationship between actions at the different levels needs to be further explained, given the importance of ensuring coordination and coherence of multilevel action;
 - (iii) Project compliance with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy needs to be better explained;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of \$30,000;
- (d) To request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Indonesia; and
- (e) To encourage the Government of Indonesia to submit through Kemitraan a fully-developed project proposal that would address the observations in subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.30/12)

Proposals from Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs)

Regular proposals:

Chad: Strengthening the Resilience of Fisheries and Aquaculture Communities to Climate Change in Chad (Project concept; Observatory for Sahara and Sahel (OSS); CHA/RIE/Food/2017/1; \$9,640,000)

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

- (a) To not endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by Observatory for Sahara and Sahel (OSS) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that OSS reformulate the proposal considering 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 ensure that the project will support concrete adaptation actions in order to be consistent with the mandate of the Adaptation Fund;
 - (ii) The proposal should describe the specific social and economic benefits generated by the project;
 - (iii) The proposal should demonstrate cost-effectiveness for components 1 and 2, reflecting the overall lack of specificity in the project design;
 - (iv) The proposal should describe how the project is in line with the priorities identified in current national policies and plans, including the national adaptation plan and/or any other adaptation-specific strategies or plans;
 - (v) The proposal should provide adequate information on how fisheries management issues that by their nature require a cross-border approach will be addressed;
 - (vi) The proposal should further elaborate on the consultation of vulnerable and women's groups and provide information on inclusion of feedback from the consulted stakeholders beyond general recommendations;
 - (vii) The proponent should elaborate on the learning and knowledge management component;
 - (viii) The proposal should include additional information on how sustainability of the project outcomes will be achieved;
- (c) To not approve the project formulation grant of \$30,000; and
- (d) To request OSS to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Chad.

(Decision B.30/13)

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Regular proposals:

Cambodia: Climate Change Adaptation through small-scale & protective infrastructure interventions in coastal settlements of Cambodia (Project concept; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); KHM/MIE/Urban/2017/1; \$5,000,000)

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

- (a) To endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to transmit to UN-Habitat the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issue:
 - (i) During project development, presentation of detailed information on tangible asset acquisition and cost-effective analysis on the basis of the asset operation should be further clarified;
 - (ii) The alignment with national policies and plans should be better explained;
- (c) To request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Government of Cambodia; and
- (d) To encourage the Government of Cambodia to submit through UN-Habitat a fully-developed project proposal that would address the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.30/14)

Côte d'Ivoire: Increasing local communities' adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change through improving climate-smart agriculture, water and energy access in the Bandama watershed of Côte d'Ivoire (Project concept; African Development Bank (AfDB); CIV/MIE/Multi/2017/1; \$9,866,905)

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

- (a) To not endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the African Development Bank (AfDB) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that AfDB reformulate 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 more detail about how the components of the project align with a common, adaptation-driven objective;
 - (ii) The proponent should strengthen the connection of the project activities to the intended beneficiaries, the assessment of cost effectiveness, and the analysis of other projects or other investments in the project site;
 - (iii) The proposal should provide additional detail on environmental and social screening, as well as an explanation of the plan for fully complying with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy during preparation of the fully-development proposal; and
- (c) To request AfDB to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Côte d'Ivoire.

(Decision B.30/15)

Mongolia: Flood Resilience in Ulaanbaatar Ger-Areas (FRUGA) - Climate Change Adaptation through community-driven small-scale protective and basic services interventions (Project concept; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); MNG/MIE/DRR/2017/1; \$4,500,000)

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

- (a) To endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to transmit to UN-Habitat 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 provide further details on proposed adaptation activities;
 - (ii) The fully-developed project document should provide further information on the ongoing activities related to waste management, including its legal and regulatory framework and overall sustainability;
 - (iii) The fully-developed project document should include information on how to maintain and sustain the proposed priority interventions;
- (c) To request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under item (b) to the Government of Mongolia; and
- (d) To encourage the Government of Mongolia to submit through UN-Habitat a fully-developed project proposal that would address the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.30/16)

Fully-developed proposals

Proposals from National Implementing Entities (NIEs)

Small-size proposals:

Federated States of Micronesia: Practical Solutions for Reducing Community Vulnerability to Climate Change in the Federated States of Micronesia (Fully-developed project document; Micronesia Conservation Trust (MCT); FSM/NIE/Multi/2016/2; \$970,000)

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

- (a) To not approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by Micronesia Conservation Trust (MCT) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that MCT reformulate 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 explain how the lessons learned from previous and ongoing projects informed the proposed project in the preparation phase;
 - (ii) The budget should be revised so that the monitoring and evaluation budget is fully covered by the administrative costs;
 - (iii) The results framework should include gender-disaggregated data, targets and indicators;
 - (iv) The project results framework should include at least one of the five core outcome indicators of the Adaptation Fund's results framework;
 - (v) The proponent should give due consideration to the potential impacts on marginalized and vulnerable groups in applying the environmental and social management plan;
 - (vi) The proposal should strengthen and provide adequate publicity for the included grievance mechanism; and
- (c) To request MCT to transmit the observations referred to in subparagraph (b) above to the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia.

(Decision B.30/17)

Regular proposals:

Cook Islands: Akamatutu'anga kia Tukatau te Ora'anga ite Pa Enea" Pa Enea Action for Resilient Livelihoods (PEARL) (Fully-developed project document; Ministry of Finance and Economic Management (MFEM); COK/NIE/Multi/2017/1; \$2,999,125)

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

(a) To not approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Management (MFEM) to the request made by the technical review;

(b) To suggest that MFEM reformulate 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 demonstrate how it proposes to addressing the challenge of maintaining quality and consistency of the supply of fresh fruits and vegetables;

(ii) The consultation process should be strengthened to include community views and understanding, notably of the project design and risks under the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy (ESP);

(iii) The fully-developed project document should include a full environmental and social management plan and provide adequate justification for the identification of risks, avoiding inconsistencies between principles for which no assessment is required for ESP compliance and the corresponding risk assessments;

(iv) The proposal should include a grievance mechanism that includes ESP-related matters, as well as other aspects such as gender policy compliance; and

(c) To request MFEM to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Cook Islands.

(Decision B.30/18)

Namibia (1): Community-based Integrated Farming System for Climate Change Adaptation (Fully-developed project document; Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN); NAM/NIE/Agri/2015/2; \$4,999,386)

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

(a) To not approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN) to the request made by the technical review;

(b) To suggest that DRFN reformulate 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 explain why the requested budget increased significantly between the endorsed concept and the fully-developed project document; this includes justifying the need for the purchase of equipment;

(ii) The proposal should clarify the existence of any specific climate-related impacts besides low yields that might be present on Omaheke and Omusati, including quantifiable impacts, to strengthen the rationale for the two areas;

(iii) The proposal should ensure that there is no redundancy in the proposed activities; this includes clarifying the difference between activities 1.3 and 1.8, and the expenses related to engagement with students, among other activities;

(iv) The proposal should provide additional information to clearly demonstrate the logical flow and connection between proposed components of the experienced climate and non-climate related challenges to more clearly demonstrate the adaptation reasoning;

(v) The proposal should include a convincing rationale for engaging students as part of the implementation strategy for this project;

(vi) The proposal should better demonstrate the sustainability of the project interventions;

(vii) The proposal should clarify how the outcomes of each meeting and community interests and perspectives were integrated;

(viii) The proposal should clarify how turning the areas into savannah by de-bushing (thwarting the natural process of ecological adaptation) constitutes making the area ecologically resilient;

(ix) The proposal should provide the outcome of the environmental and social risks identification process for all proposed project activities; and

(c) To request DRFN to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Namibia.

(Decision B.30/19)

Namibia (2): Pilot desalination plant with renewable power and membrane technology (Fully-developed project document; Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN); NAM/NIE/Water/2015/1; \$4,999,674)

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

- (a) To approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To approve the funding of \$4,999,674 for the implementation of the project, as requested by DRFN; and
- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with DRFN as the National Implementing Entity for the project. The agreement should include:
 - (i) A commitment from DRFN that an environmental impact assessment will be finalized before the beginning of activities for both sites of the project and that during the implementation of project activities, the potential environmental and social risks associated with the desalination plant activities will be monitored in compliance with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy; and
 - (ii) A commitment that, in the case of the identification of any unforeseen risks, the relevant mitigation measures will be included in an updated environmental and social management plan that will be implemented and reported to the Board through the annual programme performance reports.

(Decision B.30/20)

Proposals from Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs)

Regular proposals:

Ecuador: Increasing adaptive capacity of local communities, ecosystems and hydroelectric systems in the Toachi – Pilatón watershed with a focus on Ecosystem and Community Based Adaptation and Integrated Adaptive Watershed Management (Fully-developed project document; Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina (CAF; Development Bank of Latin America); ECU/RIE/Rural/2016/1; \$2,489,373)

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

- (a) To not approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina (CAF) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that CAF reformulate 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 evidence and analysis to support the project rationale and to justify why the proposed project is cost effective and sustainable in the long-term, and delivers benefits across social, economic and environmental parameters;

- (ii) The proposal should ensure full compliance with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy;
 - (iii) The proposal should provide clearer budgets and breakdowns of the implementing entity management fee and execution costs; and
- (c) To request that CAF transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Ecuador.

(Decision B.30/21)

Guinea-Bissau: Scaling up climate-smart agriculture in East Guinea-Bissau (Fully-developed project document; *Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement* (BOAD; West African Development Bank); GNB/RIE/Agri/2015/1; \$9,979,000)

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

- (a) To approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (BOAD) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To approve the funding of \$9,979,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by BOAD; and
- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with BOAD as the Regional Implementing Entity for the project.

(Decision B.30/22)

Togo: Increasing the resilience of vulnerable communities in the agriculture sector of Mandouri in Northern Togo (Fully-developed project document; *Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement* (BOAD; West African Development Bank); TGO/RIE/Agri/2016/1; \$10,000,000)

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

- (a) To not approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement (BOAD) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that BOAD reformulate 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 describe components 1 and 2, particularly focusing on concrete adaptation activities and how those activities contribute to climate resilience;
 - (ii) The project should provide a clear description of alternatives to the proposed measures to allow for good comparison with other possible interventions that could

have helped the inhabitants of the Kpendjal prefecture and the Canton of Mandouri adapt and build resilience;

(iii) The proposal should explain whether the project is consistent with both Togo's Accelerated Growth Strategy and the Sustainable Development Goals;

(iv) The proposal should provide more information on the establishment of a knowledge management system in the "Learning and Knowledge Management" section of the proposal;

(v) The proposal should provide a clear description of the specific consultation techniques used for each target group of stakeholders and a description of the key findings for each group, including how any issues raised were addressed in the project design;

(vi) The proposal should include risks and underlying assumptions in the project results framework;

(vii) The project should have an environmental and social management plan that meets the requirements of the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy and addresses related environmental and social risk assessment issues identified in the initial technical review. In addition, the proposal should provide adequate justification for the project category;

(viii) The project proposal should describe the sustainability of the proposed infrastructure and technologies; and

(c) To request BOAD to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Togo.

(Decision B.30/23)

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Regular proposals:

Fiji: Increasing the resilience of informal urban settlements in Fiji that are highly vulnerable to climate change and disaster risks (Fully-developed project document; the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); FJI/NIE/Urban/2016/1; \$4,235,995)

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

(a) To approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;

(b) To approve the funding of \$4,235,995 for the implementation of the project, as requested by UN-Habitat;

- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UN-Habitat as the Multilateral Implementing Entity for the project; and
- (d) To request UN-Habitat to ensure that the following issues have been addressed no later than the date of submission of the first project performance report (PPR):
 - (i) The environmental and social management plan (ESMP) for the project should be updated, based on the climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments and the resulting community-based identification and design of adaptation activities, to remove any unidentified subproject and reflect all environmental and social risks inherent in the identified adaptation activities; and
 - (ii) The updated ESMP should be submitted to the Board no later than the date of submission of the first PPR.

(Decision B.30/24)

Iraq: Building Resilience of the Agriculture Sector to Climate Change in Iraq (BRAC) (Fully-developed project document; the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); IRQ/MIE/Agri/2017/1; \$9,999,660).

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

- (a) To not approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that IFAD reformulate the proposal considering the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
 - (i) The project should demonstrate how consultation of communities, or their vulnerable groups or women, will be conducted at the local level;
 - (ii) The added value of the project should be clarified, for example in terms of the real number of targeted direct and indirect beneficiaries, not including IFAD's smallholder agriculture revitalization project baseline intervention;
 - (iii) The full proposal should describe how the project complies with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy, including by having a project-wide environmental and social management plan and a project grievance mechanism; and
- (c) To request IFAD to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Government of Iraq.

(Decision B.30/25)

Solomon Islands: Enhancing urban resilience to climate change impacts and natural disasters: Honiara (Fully-developed project document; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); SLB/MIE/Urban/2016/1; \$4,395,877).

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

- (a) To approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To approve the funding of \$4,395,877 for the implementation of the project, as requested by UN-Habitat;
- (c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UN-Habitat as the Multilateral Implementing Entity for the project; and
- (d) To request UN-Habitat to ensure that the following issues have been addressed no later than the date of submission of the first project performance report (PPR):
 - (i) The environmental and social management plan (ESMP) of the project should be updated based on the comprehensive climate change vulnerability and disaster risk assessments in the target cities and informal settlements to remove any unidentified sub-project and reflect all environmental and social risks inherent with the identified adaptation activities; and
 - (ii) The updated ESMP should be submitted to the Board no later than the date of submission of the first PPR.

(Decision B.30/26)

Review of regional project and programme proposals

Pre-concept proposals

Proposal from Regional Implementing Entity (RIE)

Argentina and Uruguay: Climate change adaptation in vulnerable coastal cities and ecosystems of the Uruguay River (Project pre-concept; *Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina* (CAF; Development Bank of Latin America); LAC/RIE/DRR/2017/1; \$13,999,996.80)

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

- (a) To endorse the project pre-concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina (CAF) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to transmit to CAF the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:

- (i) The drought-related threats and related measures should be better explained at the concept stage;
 - (ii) The project proponents should consider involving the third country to address non-climate threats to the management of the Uruguay River;
 - (iii) The concept document should identify all relevant initiatives aimed at addressing the non-climate drivers, upstream and downstream from the Uruguay River, of the identified climate-related threats, in order to seek synergies and complementarities with those initiatives;
 - (iv) At the concept document stage, the proposed components and associated expected outputs should be costed accurately to support the project's overall objective; this include costing of interventions in a realistic number of cities;
 - (v) The concept document should clarify whether there will be a need for resettlement of people in some areas targeted by the project;
 - (vi) To better demonstrate the rationale for the regional approach of the project, the concept document should better articulate how this proposed regional investment will be a more sustainable or cost-effective way of addressing the issues identified;
 - (vii) The concept document should better explain how innovative the proposed approaches or mechanisms are;
 - (viii) The concept document should elaborate on the role that the Argentina/Uruguay joint Uruguay River commission, Comisión Administradora del Río Uruguay, will play in the project given its mandate, which includes the land/water interface;
- (c) To request CAF to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Argentina and Uruguay; and
 - (d) To encourage the Governments of Argentina and Uruguay to submit through CAF a project concept that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.30/27)

Burkina Faso, Mali: Adapted Building: Transformative Practices for Better Building in the Sahel (Pre-concept for a regional project; Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); AFR/NIE/Food/2017/1; US\$4,790,000)

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

- (a) To not endorse the pre-concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that OSS reformulate 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 issue:

- (i) The proposal should include a stronger justification for the project rationale and the approach to delivering concrete adaptation outcomes. The lack of baseline and situation analysis renders the project activities unsubstantiated in the context of the prevalent climate change impacts in the two countries;
- (ii) The proposal should strengthen its connection to food security and provide a better rationale for climate change adaptation activities related to deforestation;
- (c) To not approve the project formulation grant request request for \$20,000; and
- (d) To request OSS to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Governments of Burkina Faso and Mali.

(Decision B.30/28)

Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda: Strengthening drought resilience of small holder farmers and pastoralists in the IGAD region (Project pre-concept; Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); AFR/RIE/DRR/2017/1; \$12,990,000)

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

- (a) To endorse the project pre-concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to transmit to OSS the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following recommendations for the project concept stage:
 - (i) The project concept should specify the sub-regions that are most drought-prone and on which the project will therefore concentrate;
 - (ii) The project concept should provide additional details on, for example, the aspects of the projects and resources devoted to addressing the pastoralists versus farmers;
 - (iii) The concept should demonstrate how local institutions and extension agents will be targeted and included in implementation;
 - (iv) The concept should provide consideration of how availability of water resources and especially water points for livestock, which are mainly groundwater based, will be addressed in the project;
 - (v) The concept should address how agreements on stock routes can be modified or made more flexible in case of drought and provision be made to prevent pastoralists from getting into conflicts with sedentary farmers or encroaching on protected areas;
 - (vi) The concept should provide further details on the gender dimension and the differentiated rights of sedentary versus pastoralist groups;

- (vii) The proponent should more clearly outline how it will engage, involve and benefit women and other marginalized groups;
- (viii) The concept should provide more detailed evidence of the sustainability of the project outcomes;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of \$20,000;
- (d) To request OSS to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Governments of Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda; and
- (e) To encourage the Governments of Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda to submit, through OSS, a project concept that addresses the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.30/29)

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea: Increasing local communities' adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change through forest landscape restoration (Project pre-concept; The African Development Bank (AfDB); AFR/MIE/Food/2017/1; \$14,000,000).

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

- (a) To endorse the project pre-concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the African Development Bank (AfDB) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to transmit to AfDB the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision as well as the following issues:
 - (i) The project concept should further elaborate on innovations introduced through the proposed project;
 - (ii) The project concept should better clarify the project coordination arrangements facilitating the involvement of stakeholders at national and sub-national levels;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of \$20,000;
- (d) To request AfDB to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea; and
- (e) To encourage the Governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea to submit, through AfDB, a project concept that addresses the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.30/30)

Cote D'Ivoire and Ghana: Improved resilience of coastal communities in Cote d' Ivoire and Ghana
(Project pre-concept, United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat);
AFR/MIE/DRR/2017/1; \$14,000,000)

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

(a) To endorse the project pre-concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;

(b) To request the secretariat to transmit to UN-Habitat the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following recommendations for the project concept stage:

(i) The project concept should provide further description of the climate-change-related hazards at the municipal and community levels;

(ii) The project concept should specify the concrete measures envisaged by the project;

(iii) The project concept should provide details of the consultative process, stating clearly the marginalized and vulnerable populations consulted (women, girls, youth and indigenous groups);

(iv) The project concept should demonstrate how community-based income-generation activities will be gender inclusive to ensure benefits are shared equally by all members of the community;

(v) The project concept should provide additional details on, for example, aspects of the projects and resources devoted to the selected local governments in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire, as well as resources specially targeting vulnerable groups, such as the number of vulnerable persons (gender-disaggregated) targeted in training and other capacity-building activities;

(vi) The project concept should specify the allocation of resources to knowledge-sharing activities for target and vulnerable populations at the local level;

(vii) The project concept should provide details on how different revenue-generating activities would be developed and adopted by communities in collaboration with the private sector;

(c) To request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana; and

(d) To encourage the Governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana to submit, through UN-Habitat, a project concept that addresses the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.30/31)

Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, Togo: Integrating Flood and Drought Management and Early Warning for Climate Change Adaptation in the Volta Basin (Project pre-concept; World Meteorological Organization (WMO); AFR/MIE/DRR/2017/2; \$7,920,000)

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

- (a) To endorse the project pre-concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that WMO reformulate 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 project concept should provide more information on the direct beneficiaries;
 - (ii) The project concept should strengthen the cohesion between the objectives, outcomes and outputs;
 - (iii) The project concept should specify the consultative process as regards the expected beneficiaries and vulnerable communities;
 - (iv) The project concept should specify the sustainability aspect of component 2;
 - (v) With regard to flood and drought forecasting, inclusion of consideration of differences in regional coverage and stakeholders in the project concept is recommended;
 - (vi) The proposal should provide further information on the approach envisaged to guarantee adequate multi-level coordination;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of \$20,000;
- (d) To request WMO to transmit the observations referred to in subparagraph (b) above to the Governments of Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, and Togo; and
- (e) To encourage the Governments of Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, and Togo to submit through WMO a project concept that would address the obligations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.30/32)

Concept proposals

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica: Risk Reduction Management Centers: local adaptation response to national climate and early warning information in the Caribbean (Project concept; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); LAC/MIE/DRR/2015/1; \$4,969,367)

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

- (a) To endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to transmit to UNDP 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 demonstrate that a comprehensive consultation process has taken place, including all countries involved in the project and the relevant communities;
 - (ii) The fully-developed project document should ensure that a knowledge management component is included as part of the project activities;
- (c) To approve the project formulation grant of \$80,000;
- (d) To request UNDP to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Cuba, Dominican Republic and Jamaica; and
- (e) To encourage the Governments of Cuba, Dominican Republic and Jamaica to submit through UNDP a fully-developed project document that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.30/33)

Thailand and Vietnam: Enhancing Climate Resilience in the Greater Mekong Sub-region through Ecosystem-based Adaptation in the context of South-South cooperation (Project concept; United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); LAC/MIE/DRR/2015/1; \$7,000,000)

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

- (a) To endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To request the secretariat to transmit to UNEP 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 ensure that all activities are identified to a point where environmental and social risks can be effectively and comprehensively identified;
 - (ii) The fully-developed project document should explain how the development of proposed activities in China are in line with relevant technical standards in China;
 - (iii) The fully-developed project document should demonstrate that regional activities addressing transboundary issues directly would be undertaken;

- (c) To request UNEP to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Thailand and Vietnam; and
- (d) To encourage the Governments of Thailand and Vietnam to submit through UNEP a fully-developed project document that would also address the observations under subparagraph (b) above.

(Decision B.30/34)

Fully-developed proposals

Proposals from Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs)

Chile and Ecuador: Reducing climate vulnerability in urban and semi urban areas in cities in Latin America (Fully-developed project document; *Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina* (CAF; Development Bank of Latin America); LAC/RIE/DRR/2015/1; \$13,910,400)

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

- (a) To not approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the *Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina* (CAF) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that CAF reformulate 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 identify the risks of unnecessary environmental and social harm in line with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy, present the evidence-based findings of impact assessments for those principles for which risks have been identified, and formulate management or mitigation measures accordingly, in a manner commensurate with the risks. The relevant information should be included in the main proposal document in a concise but adequate way. Any necessary additional documentation should be consistent with the information in the proposal document;
 - (ii) The proponent should consolidate the proposal and its components, following the application template, in a concise, coherent and clear manner, focusing on relevant information;
 - (iii) The proposal should include implementation arrangements for the environmental and social management measures needed to comply with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy, reflecting a consolidated and integrated environmental and social management plan; and
- (c) To request CAF to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Governments of Chile and Ecuador.

(Decision B.30/35)

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Cambodia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Thailand, Viet Nam: Groundwater resources in Greater Mekong Sub-region: Collaborative management to increase resilience (Fully-developed project document; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); ASI/MIE/Water/2015/1; \$4,898,775)

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

- (a) To not approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) To suggest that UNESCO reformulate 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 further information on groundwater-use-related technical standards at the national level;
 - (ii) The proposal should demonstrate compliance with the Adaptation Fund's environmental and social policy (ESP), including through appropriate, evidence-based identification of risks for all activities;
 - (iii) The proposal should include an environmental and social management plan for the project as a whole, clearly outlining a functional and effective mechanism to identify and manage ESP risks for activities or locations that are unidentified at this point, defined as unidentified subprojects (USPs). Otherwise, at the fully-developed proposal stage, if possible, the proposal should identify the USPs and include demonstration of ESP compliance in the proposal; and
- (c) To request UNESCO to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) above to the Governments of Cambodia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam.

(Decision B.30/36)

Agenda Item 7: Report of twenty-first meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee

a) Annual performance report for the fiscal year 2017

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

- (a) To approve the Adaptation Fund's Annual Performance Report (APR) for the fiscal year 2017 as contained in document AFB/EFC.21/3/Rev.1, excluding annex 6; and
- (b) To request the secretariat:

- (i) To continue presenting the APR in the standard format for the fiscal year 2018 and beyond; and
- (ii) To subsequently prepare a summarized version for the general public in a reader-friendly format, in line with the design presented in annex 6 to the document, following the approval of the APR by the Board.

(Decision B.30/37)*b) Options for an evaluation function and cost implications*

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

- (a) To approve the option of re-establishing a long-term evaluation function for the Adaptation Fund through a Technical Evaluation Reference Group (TERG), as described in documents AFB/EFC.20/3 and AFB/EFC.21/4;
- (b) To request the secretariat:
 - (i) To make the necessary arrangements for the establishment of the TERG, as described in document AFB/EFC.21/4;
 - (ii) To prepare the terms of reference of the TERG for consideration by the Board intersessionally;
 - (iii) To recruit the experts constituting the TERG following the Board's approval of the terms of reference as per subparagraph (b) (ii); and
 - (iv) To present a budget and work plan for the TERG for consideration by the EFC at its twenty-second meeting;
- (c) To invite the Independent Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility to support the secretariat in setting up the TERG through providing guidance/advice; and
- (d) To request the EFC to review the long-term evaluation function of the TERG at its twenty-ninth meeting.

(Decision B.30/38)*c) New annex to the operational policies and guidelines related to project/programme implementation*

39. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to approve the annex to document AFB/EFC.21/5 as a new annex to the operational policies and guidelines related to project/programme implementation.

(Decision B.30/39)

d) *Financial issues**Investment income*

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

- (a) To approve option 2 for addressing the issue of investment income earned by implementing entities on amounts held in respect of project grants, namely allowing implementing entities to use the funds for project/programme purposes, as set out in document AFB/EFC.21/6; and
- (b) To request each implementing entity that had received funding from the Adaptation Fund:
 - (i) To hold the income earned on amounts held in respect of Adaptation Fund project grants in their Implementing Entity Grant Account;
 - (ii) To use the income earned on amounts held in respect of Adaptation Fund project grants solely for the purposes of the associated project/programme; and
 - (iii) To report such income and the associated expenditures to the Board as part of the regular financial reporting; and
- (c) To request the secretariat:
 - (i) To gather more comprehensive information from implementing entities on amounts held in respect of project grants;
 - (ii) Based on the information gathered, to prepare a document that included some specific examples of accounting/treasury practices regarding income earned by implementing entities on amounts held in respect of project grants, for consideration by the EFC at its twenty-second meeting; and
 - (iii) If necessary, to prepare a proposal for an amendment to the standard legal agreement between the Board and the implementing entity for consideration by the EFC at its twenty-second meeting in order to address the issue of income earned by implementing entities.

(Decision B.30/40)

Further development of the Financial Intermediary Fund collaboration platform

41. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee with respect to the Financial Intermediary Fund collaboration platform and the information set out in document AFB/EFC.21/7, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To approve an increase in the Board and Secretariat budget for fiscal year 2018 of \$110,000 for the enhancement of the Financial Intermediary Fund collaboration platform for fiscal year 2018; and

(b) To request the trustee to transfer the amount in (a) above to the Secretariat, given that the \$60,000 approved by the Board at its twenty-ninth meeting would cover the remaining \$40,000 for enhancement costs and the \$20,000 in revised maintenance costs for fiscal year 2018.

(Decision B.30/41)

Agenda Item 8: Issues remaining from the twenty-ninth meeting

a) Medium-term strategy for the Fund

42. Having considered the draft medium-term strategy for the Fund, contained in annex 1 of document AFB/B.30/5/Rev.1, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) To adopt the medium-term strategy as amended by the Board, as contained in the Annex 1 of the document AFB/B.30/5/Rev.1 (the MTS); and

(b) To request the secretariat:

(i) To broadly disseminate the MTS and work with key stakeholders to build understanding and support;

(ii) To prepare, under the supervision of the MTS task force, a draft implementation plan for operationalizing the MTS, containing a draft budget and addressing key assumptions and risks, including but not limited to funding and political risks, for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting; and

(iii) To draft, as part of the implementation plan, the updates/modifications to the operational policies and guidelines of the Adaptation Fund needed to facilitate implementation of the MTS, for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting.

(Decision B.30/42)

b) Strategic discussion on objectives and further steps of the Fund. Potential linkages between the Fund and the Green Climate Fund

43. Having considered documents AFB/B.30/6 and AFB/B.30/6/Add.1 and the update provided by the secretariat, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

(a) Based on decision B.29/40, to request the Chair and Vice-Chair, assisted by the secretariat, to attend 'an annual dialogue' to be initiated by the Green Climate Fund (GCF) in order to enhance complementarity and to actively engage in a structured conversation with the GCF board, with a view to exploring concrete steps to enhance complementarity, including options for fund-to-fund arrangements and accreditation;

(b) To request the secretariat:

(i) To initiate the process of accreditation with the GCF;

- (ii) To prepare an assessment of options for fund-to-fund arrangements, as described in pillar 1 in the GCF operational framework for complementarity and coherence, as contained in document GCF/B.17/08, for consideration by the Board at its thirty-first meeting;
 - (iii) To prepare an information document on the comparative advantages of the Adaptation Fund for the purposes of board-level discussions between the two funds on fund-to-fund arrangements, including joint financing and the decision-making process; and
 - (iv) To pursue discussions with the GCF secretariat on the concrete activities in the area of complementarity and coherence identified by the Board in decision B.26/26; and
- (c) To request the Chair and the secretariat to report to the Board at its thirty-first meeting on the progress made in the activities described in subparagraphs (a) and (b).

(Decision B.30/43)

c) Updated operational policies and guidelines to include procedures related to the Readiness Programme

44. The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To approve the operational policies and guidelines and annex 5 to the operational policies and guidelines as amended in document AFB/B.30/7; and
- (b) To request the secretariat to notify all accrediting implementing entities of the updated operational policies and guidelines.

(Decision B.30/44)

d) Updated results framework of the Readiness Programme

45. The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) To approve the results framework of the Readiness Programme as amended in document AFB/B.30/8;
- (b) To approve the project performance report template as amended in document AFB/B.30/8; and
- (c) To request the secretariat:
 - (i) To notify all implementing entities of the amendment to the project performance report template; and
 - (ii) To implement the Readiness Programme in line with the amended results framework.

(Decision B.30/45)

Agenda Item 13: Date and venue of meetings in 2018 and onward

46. The Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- (a) To hold its thirty-third meeting from 12 to 15 March 2019 in Bonn, Germany; and
- (b) To hold its thirty-fourth meeting from 8 to 11 October 2019 in Bonn, Germany.

(Decision B.30/46)

Agenda Item 15: Other matters

a) *Election of officers for the next period of office*

47. The Adaptation Fund Board decided:

(a) To elect:

(i) Mr. Victor Viñas (Dominican Republic, Latin America and the Caribbean) as Chair of the Board;

(ii) Ms. Tove Zetterström-Goldmann (Sweden, Annex I Parties) as Chair of the Ethics and Finance Committee; and

(iii) Mr. Antonio Navarra (Italy, Annex I Parties) as Chair of the Accreditation Panel; and

b) To elect the remaining officers intersessionally.

(Decision B.30/47)