



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/B.30/12
29 January 2018

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

Thirtieth Meeting
Bonn, Germany, 10-13 October 2017

REPORT OF THE THIRTIETH MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

Introduction

1. The thirtieth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) was held at the 'Langer Eugen' United Nations Campus, in Bonn, Germany, from 10 to 13 October 2017, in conjunction with the twenty-first meetings of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) and the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) of the Board.
2. The meeting was broadcast live through the websites of the Adaptation Fund (the Fund) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). The UNCCD also provided logistical and administrative support for the meetings of the Board and its committees.
3. The list of the members and alternate members who participated in the meeting is attached as Annex I. A list of accredited observers present at the meeting can be found in document AFB/B.30/Inf.3.

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the meeting

4. The meeting was opened at 9:15 a.m. on 10 October 2017, by the Chair, Mr. Michael Jan Hendrik Kracht (Germany, Annex I Parties).
5. The Chair informed the Board that both the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the PPRC were unable to attend that committee's twenty-first meeting. The Board agreed to designate Ms. Margarita Caso Chavez (Mexico, Non-Annex I Parties) to serve as the acting chair of the PPRC at its twenty-first meeting, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the Board, paragraph 11.
6. The meeting was then suspended and reconvened on the morning of 12 October 2017.

Agenda Item 2: Organizational matters

a) Adoption of the agenda

7. The Board considered the provisional agenda contained in document AFB/B.30/1 and the annotated provisional agenda and provisional timetable contained in document AFB/B.30/2.

8. One sub-item, election of officers for the next period of office, was proposed for consideration under other matters.

9. The Board adopted the agenda as orally amended. The agenda is attached in Annex II to the present report.

b) Organization of work

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

11. The Board welcomed Mr. Charles Mutai (Kenya, Non-Annex I Parties), who was elected intersessionally (decision B.29-30/4) to replace Ms. Fatuma Hussein (Kenya, Non-Annex I Parties), who had resigned.

12. The following members and alternate members declared conflicts of interest:

- (a) Mr. Ibila Djibril (Benin, Africa)
- (b) Mr. Aram Ter-Zakaryan (Armenia, Eastern Europe)
- (c) Mr. Lucas Di Pietro Paolo (Argentina, Latin America and the Caribbean)
- (d) Mr. Víctor Viñas (Dominican Republic, Latin America and the Caribbean)
- (e) Ms. Yadira González Columbié (Cuba, Latin America and the Caribbean)
- (f) Mr. Chebet Maikut (Uganda, Least Developed Countries)
- (g) Mr. Samuela Lagataki (Fiji, Small Island Developing States)
- (h) Ms. Patience Dampsey (Ghana, Non-Annex I Parties)
- (i) Mr. Charles Mutai (Kenya, Non-Annex I Parties)

Agenda Item 3: Report on the activities of the Chair

13. The Chair provided a brief report on activities he had undertaken on the Board's behalf during the intersessional period between the twenty-ninth and thirtieth Board meetings, with the support of the secretariat.

14. Supported by the secretariat, the Chair had represented the Board at the Bonn Climate Change Conference and subsidiary body meetings in June, participating in negotiations related to the Fund, a number of meetings including an informal meeting with one of the co-chairs of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) Board, and an Adaptation Fund side event. During the period, he had also signed agreements for three project formulation grants, eight single country projects and four regional projects, an indication that the Fund had many interesting projects entering implementation. He had also signed a number of tranche transfer requests and handled other technical paper work associated with the Fund's activities. A highlight of the period had been the preparations for the 10th anniversary of the Fund, with many discussions held with the secretariat to prepare the event and the anniversary publication. Other activities included discussions with the secretariat and other Board members on strategic issues, including the medium-term strategy, which had been particularly important in previous couple of months. Finally, the Chair had participated in multiple events on behalf of the Board, and in the preparation of the press releases for those events.

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

Agenda Item 4: Report on activities of the secretariat

16. The Manager of the secretariat reported on the secretariat's activities during the intersessional period, as more fully described in document AFB/B.30/3.

17. The secretariat had organized and participated in a number of events and meetings during the intersessional period and in particular had organized two readiness workshops, and one readiness webinar. It had, in the margins of the forty-sixth sessions of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI 46) and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA 46), organized a side-event on accelerating implementation of the Paris Agreement and, in partnership with the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN), had arranged a meeting with organizations providing readiness support for adaptation. The secretariat had also conducted three portfolio monitoring missions, had attended, as an observer, three meetings of the GCF Board and had attended a number of conferences and workshops organized by other organizations at which it had made presentations on adaptation. In conjunction with the GCF and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) it was also making preparations for a "day of direct access entities" to be held in Bonn in November 2017.

18. The secretariat had prepared 15 draft intersessional decisions and had prepared a number of documents for the present meeting. It had also reviewed 26 project performance reports (PPRs), had prepared an annual performance report (APR), and had initiated regular collaborative meetings on gender with the GCF, the GEF and the climate investment funds. It had also established a dedicated web page on its website for its Ad Hoc Complaint Handling Mechanism (ACHM).

19. The Manager of the secretariat informed the Board that Mr. Matthew Pueschel had been selected through a competitive process for the position of Communications Officer, a role he had been performing as a short-term consultant. Also of note was the arrival of Ms. Cristina Dengel as knowledge management officer, and the departure of Ms. Alicia Marie Austin, who had finished her internship. He said that Ms. Alyssa Maria Gomes, formerly an intern, continued to work with the secretariat as a short-term consultant.

20. In response to a request for a clarification about his oral report, the Chair said that the practice of the Board was for the Chair to present an oral report on his activities the substantive parts of which were covered in the written report of the secretariat (AFB/B.30/3).

21. In response to a query about the competitive process for selecting staff, the Manager of the secretariat explained that all staff vacancies were posted on the website of the World Bank, among others, and that all staff members were selected through a competitive process. He said that he had mentioned the process of the selection of Mr. Pueschel to show that although he had already been employed as a short-term consultant he had still gone through an open competitive process before he had been selected as Communications Officer, demonstrating that he had been the most qualified applicant of the position.

22. The Chair welcomed Ms. Dengel and Ms. Martina Dorigo who had joined the secretariat in February 2017 but had been unable to attend the previous meeting of the Board.

23. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the report on the activities of the secretariat.

Agenda Item 5: Report of the Accreditation Panel

24. The Chair of the Accreditation Panel, Mr. Chebet Maikut (Uganda, Least Developed Countries) reported that since the last Board meeting, the Panel had held its twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth meetings in Washington D.C., on 2-3 May 2017 and 18-19 September 2017. He recalled that the report of twenty-fifth meeting had been submitted for the Board's consideration intersessionally, and presented the report of the Panel's twenty-sixth meeting (document AFB/B.30/4).

25. He began by expressing the Panel's appreciation for an outgoing expert member, Mr. Bert Keuppens, and informing the Board that a new panel member would join the Panel at its next meeting, scheduled for January 2018. He then went on to report on applications for accreditation and reaccreditation since the last Board meeting. Three implementing entities had been re-accredited since the twenty-ninth meeting of the Board, namely the African Development Bank (AfDB) (Decision B.29-30/1), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (Decision B.29-30/12) and Agence pour le Développement Agricole (ADA) (Decision B.29-30/14). In terms of general trends in accreditation and re-accreditation, the Fund had accredited 43 implementing entities to date, and was currently reviewing another 14 applications for accreditation, including 2 new applications received prior to the panel's twenty-sixth meeting. Of the 43 accredited entities, 14 had been re-accredited and another 7 had applications for re-accreditation currently under review, including three that were being fast-tracked.

26. In addition to reviewing applications, the Panel had discussed ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the accreditation process. In particular, it had reviewed the guidance for designated authorities in selecting a national implementing entity (NIE), and concluded that while useful, the guideline should be updated to emphasize that its use by the designated authorities would facilitate the accreditation process. The necessary update would be finalized at the Panel's next meeting.

27. In closing, he informed the Board that the Panel's twenty-seventh meeting was scheduled for 30–31 January 2017, in Washington D.C., and underscored the Panel's high regard for the secretariat's hard work in connection with accreditation.

28. A short discussion followed, during which the Board was informed that the GCF was also reviewing its accreditation process, and it was suggested that the Board look into possibilities for simplifying the Fund's accreditation process for entities already accredited by the GCF. In response, a representative of the secretariat recalled that two policies were currently in place, whereby entities accredited by the Fund were eligible for fast-track accreditation by the GCF, and entities considered for re-accreditation by the Fund were eligible for fast-track re-accreditation process if they had been accredited by the GCF within the previous four years. Responding to a query regarding the timeline of the accreditation process, she also said that under the approved process, the shortest timeline could be six months for the three parties to the accreditation process, namely the applicant entity, the Accreditation Panel and the secretariat, to arrive at a result. She stressed, however, that the process was country driven, and could take up to a year or longer depending on the progress of each application. There was general agreement to continue the discussion under Item 8 (b) on linkages with the GCF.

29. It was also noted that the current accreditation process had taken many years to set up and was working well, although a report could also be useful as a stock-taking exercise, including lessons learned.

30. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the report of the Accreditation Panel as contained in document AFB/B.30/4.

31. 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 subparagraph (a) and, if necessary, an update off the re-accreditation process adopted by decision B.22/3.

(Decision B.30/1)

32. 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)

33. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to accredit the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) of the United Republic 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

34. Ms. Margarita Caso Chavez (Mexico, Non-Annex I), acting Chair of the PPRC, presented the report of the PPRC (AFB/PPRC.21/38).

35. In response to a query regarding the wording of the decisions, a representative of the secretariat explained that when a decision was taken to either 'not endorse' or 'not approve' projects and programmes the proponents were encouraged to reformulate their submissions. He also said, with respect to the perceived discrepancy between the US\$ 19 million for regional projects and programmes approved intersessionally, mentioned orally by the acting Chair, and the total cumulative amount of US\$ 26.3 million, recorded in the report of the PPRC, that the former represented the total amount approved intersessionally while the latter amount represented the cumulative approvals which included: the amount approved intersessionally, the amount approved at the previous meeting of the Board and several project formulation grants (PFGs) that had been approved since the inception of the pilot programme.

36. It was also observed several proposals had not been endorsed because of a failure to demonstrate adequate adaptation reasoning or adequate adaptation benefits. Those proposals had not been granted PFGs, either, and it was asked how those proposals could be developed to address those issues without PFGs.

37. The representative of the secretariat explained that when using the two-step process, proponents submitted a project concept which, if approved, would be then developed into a fully-developed project document. If a concept submitted by an NIE was endorsed, in accordance with the Operational Policies and Guidelines (OPG) a PFG could then also be awarded for up to US\$ 30,000. The proponents of project concepts had to show that their proposals addressed adaptation before they could be approved. He also said that NIEs sometimes served a channel for concepts that been developed by others and that there was sometimes a learning curve to distinguish between adaptation projects and regular development projects.

38. The Board approved the following decisions on the matters considered by the PPRC at its twenty-first meeting:

(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; US\$ 998,878)

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

- (a) Not 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 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) Not to approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 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; US\$ 905,109)

40. 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 US\$ 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; US\$ 946,287)

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

- (a) Not 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 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) Not to 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; US\$ 990,000)

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

- (a) Not 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 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) Not to approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 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; US\$ 589,975)

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

(a) Not 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 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) Not to approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 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; US\$ 1,000,000)

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

- (a) Not 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 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) Not to approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 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; US\$ 1,435,100)

45. 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 US\$ 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; US\$ 2,506,000)

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

- (a) Not to 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) Not to approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 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; US\$ 4,169,987)

47. 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 US\$ 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; Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); CHA/RIE/Food/2017/1; US\$ 9,640,000)

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

- (a) Not to endorse the project 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 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) Not to approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 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; US\$ 5,000,000)

49. 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 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; US\$ 9,866,905)

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

(a) Not to 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; US\$ 4,500,000)

51. 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; US\$ 970,000)

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

- (a) Not to approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the 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; US\$ 2,999,125)

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

- (a) Not to 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; US\$ 4,999,386)

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

- (a) Not 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 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 rural desalination plants using renewable power and membrane technology (Fully-developed project document; Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN); NAM/NIE/Water/2015/1; US\$ 4,999,674)

55. 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 US\$ 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; US\$ 2,489,373)

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

- (a) Not to approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the *Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina* (CAF; Development Bank of Latin America) 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; US\$ 9,979,000)

57. 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; West African Development Bank) to the request made by the technical review;

- (b) To approve the funding of US\$ 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; US\$ 10,000,000)

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

- (a) Not to approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the *Banque Ouest Africaine de Développement* (BOAD; West African Development Bank) 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; US\$ 4,235,995)

59. 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 US\$ 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).

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

- (a) Not to 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; US\$ 4,395,877).

61. 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 US\$ 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 Entities (RIEs)

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; US\$ 13,999,996.80)

62. 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 *Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina* (CAF; Development Bank of Latin America) 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)

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

- (a) Not to 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) Not to approve the project formulation grant request of US\$ 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)

64. 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 US\$ 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; US\$ 14,000,000).

65. 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 US\$ 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; US\$ 14,000,000)

66. 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; and

(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; US\$ 7,920,000)

67. 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 US\$ 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; US\$ 4,969,367)

68. 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 the 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 US\$ 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; US\$ 7,000,000)

69. 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 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; US\$ 13,910,400)

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

- (a) Not to approve the project document, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by the *Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina* (CAF; Development Bank of Latin America) 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; US\$ 4,898,775)

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

- (a) Not to 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

72. Ms. Patience Dampney (Ghana, Non-Annex I Parties), Chair of the EFC, presented the report of the EFC (AFB/EFC.21/10).

73. Based on the recommendations of the EFC and the proposal made during the presentation of the report, the Board approved the following decisions on the matters considered by the EFC at its twenty-first meeting.

a) Annual performance report for the fiscal year 2017

74. 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

75. 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 sub-paragraph (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

76. 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

77. 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 relevant document that includes 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

78. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee with respect to the Financial Intermediary Fund collaboration platform as 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 US\$ 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 referred to in subparagraph (a) to the secretariat, given that the US\$ 60,000 approved by the Board at its twenty-ninth meeting would cover the remaining US\$ 40,000 for enhancement costs and the US\$ 20,000 in revised maintenance costs for fiscal year 2018.

(Decision B.30/41)

79. The revised administrative budget for the Board and secretariat for fiscal year 2018 is contained in Annex III to the present report.

Agenda Item 8: Issues remaining from the twenty-ninth meeting*a) Medium-term strategy for the Fund*

80. Introducing the item, the Chair drew attention to document AFB/B.30/5, which contained a revised draft medium-term strategy prepared by the secretariat and an external consultant, under the supervision and guidance of the medium-term strategy task force. He thanked the secretariat, the task force members and the consultant for their work on developing the strategy, which was based on the three pillars of action, innovation and learning. The consultant then presented the strategy contained in the annex to the document.

81. During the discussion on the matter, a number of questions arose in relation to the budgetary implications of the proposed strategy. In response, the Manager of the secretariat noted that the action pillar to a great degree reflected what the Fund was already doing. Other areas of activity indicated as being new would be set out in the yet-to-be-developed strategic plan, which would be accompanied by a budget.

82. Numerous amendments to the document were also proposed during the discussion. With respect to format and presentation, comments related to making the strategy document clearer by paring it down, adding an executive summary, and breaking it into three distinct sections. Other recommended modifications related to additional issues to be addressed in the document. These included: increasing the focus on external factors in the risk discussion; addressing accreditation issues that the Board had been grappling with, such as the US\$ 10 million cap and targeting; taking into account linkages and ongoing discussions with the GCF; and defining the Fund's role in the broader climate finance landscape. It was suggested that the strategy should clearly state that the Fund's mission was to serve the Paris Agreement, and identify the specific articles of the Paris Agreement that were relevant to that mission. Under resource mobilization, the strategy should mention Articles 6.2 and 6.4 of the Paris Agreement and the potential for new carbon credits that could be a new source of capitalization for the Fund.

83. The value of having a steering group to oversee the development of the strategic plan was questioned. In addition, it was requested that the strategic plan, which was essentially an action plan for implementing the strategy, be referred to as an implementation plan.

84. Responding to some of the comments, the Manager of the secretariat underscored that the strategy had been developed under the guidance of the task force, and that a key question had been the appropriate level of abstraction for the strategy and the desired balance between the practical and the theoretical. The secretariat had aimed to develop a strategy that was applicable in a relatively

short time, and to avoid being too specific on practical issues to allow the Board flexibility in how it managed the Fund.

85. Subsequently, the consultant presented document AFB/B.30.5/Rev.1 containing an amended version of the strategy that took into account comments made during the discussion.

86. 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

87. Introducing the sub-item, the Chair said that the annual dialogue with the GCF would take place on the margins of the twenty-third session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP 23) and reported that he had held informal consultations with one of the co-chairs of the GCF in the margins of SBI 46 and SBSTA 46.

88. The representative of the secretariat introduced document AFB/B.30/6 which provided background on the development of linkages with the GCF. She reminded the Board that it had adopted a two-track approach: the first track being the ongoing discussions between the secretariats of the Fund and the GCF on concrete activities, with the second track being participation of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board in the annual dialogue and in formal meetings with the co-chairs of the GCF. She said that the GCF had recently adopted an operational framework on complementarity and coherence with other funds which consisted of four pillars, one of which was board-level discussions on fund-to-fund arrangements. That could include a memorandum of understanding (MOU), accreditation with the GCF, co-financing of projects or joint activities such as for capacity building. The secretariat had continued its collaboration with the GCF secretariat, exploring the possibility of scaling up or replicating projects of the Fund through additional GCF funding, and had

discussed other areas of possible collaboration. She then explained the possible linkages with the GCF through either accreditation or a MOU.

89. It was pointed out that the Board had been discussing this issue for a number of years and that it was important to move the process forward. One way for the Fund to access funding from the GCF was accreditation according to the Governing Instrument of the GCF. The Board should now engage in the accreditation process because, unless there was some mechanism to fast track the process, accreditation could take a long time. There were already many applications in the pipeline for accreditation with the GCF. The Adaptation Fund needed to further understand the requirements of accreditation with the GCF and should also consider the GCF's fit-for-purpose approach in the accreditation process. Others, however, suggested that more information was required on all the pillars of the operational framework on complementarity and coherence; a better understanding of the elements of a possible MOU should also be explored. Consequently, the secretariat should be requested to prepare a paper for the next meeting of the Board that addressed the advantages and disadvantages of all the pillars.

90. In response to a query about participation in the annual dialogue, the Manager of the secretariat explained that it would consist of the chairs of the climate funds under the Convention and might even include some from outside the Convention.

91. The representative of the secretariat said that although all four pillars were important, the first pillar seemed to provide a way forward for linkages between the two funds. While the other three pillars were also important, the secretariat had already collaborated with the GCF secretariat under those pillars. Although it was true that the GCF worked through accredited entities there were still a number of options for cooperation with the GCF without being accredited.

92. The Board continued its discussion of the sub-item in a closed session.

93. 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 toward 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 continue 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*

94. The representative of the secretariat introduced document AFB/B.30/7 which had been prepared pursuant to Decision B.29/42. He said that the secretariat had updated the general formatting and consistency of the OPG, making several improvements and clarifications to the text to include procedures for the review and approval of projects under the readiness programme. The proposed amendments would be introduced to the main text of the OPG and to the templates contained in Annex 5 of the OPG.

95. 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 accredited implementing entities of the updated operational policies and guidelines.

(Decision B.30/44)*d) Updated results framework of the Readiness Programme*

96. The representative of the secretariat introduced document AFB/B.30/8 which had been prepared pursuant to Decision B.29/42 (b) (iii) and (b) (iv). He explained the modifications that had been made to the results framework of the readiness programme so that it was aligned with the Fund's strategic results framework, its knowledge management strategy, its evaluation framework, and its performance monitoring and reporting system.

97. 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 9: Reports of the portfolio monitoring missions to Egypt, Georgia and Turkmenistan

98. The representative of the secretariat introduced the report of the portfolio monitoring mission to Egypt (AFB/B.30/9) and the report of the portfolio monitoring missions to Georgia and Turkmenistan (AFB/B.30/10).

99. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the documents.

Agenda Item 13: Communications and outreach

100. The representative of the secretariat reported on communication activities carried out by the secretariat since the previous Board meeting, as well as on the planning for upcoming events. He began by setting out the main messages of the communications programme. The Fund was growing, functioning well and in high demand, and had transparent concrete, localized, effective and often ground-breaking projects that could be scaled up or replicated by others through knowledge sharing. In addition, it had pioneering climate finance innovations like direct access and forward-thinking policies and flexible programmes that were responsive to countries' needs. The strong momentum gained in recent years was already contributing to the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals. Finally, annual fundraising targets were highlighted, and would be a particular focus around the time of the COP.

101. He then went on to describe the secretariat's communications output during the period. A steady stream of news releases and project stories had been issued through the Fund's website, as well as six original tenth anniversary stories. In terms of social media, five Flickr albums had been produced for, among other things, the Egypt, Georgia and Turkmenistan monitoring missions, as well as a steady stream of tweets and story and thought leadership posts on Facebook and LinkedIn, and two original videos on the Fund's tenth anniversary and the readiness workshop for the Caribbean region. Preparation of a longer form anniversary video had also begun. On the outreach side, speeches, talking points/messaging, briefing notes, and posters had been prepared, as well as web and print stories and flyers on the fund made available in three languages – all for use in exhibits, readiness seminars, climate conferences, project monitoring missions and multimedia outreach to partners, stakeholders and the public.

102. In terms of key results for the period, web page views were up almost 6 per cent and unique visitors almost 14 per cent, with the top five most-viewed web pages indicating interest in key areas of the Fund. The Fund's Twitter presence continued to grow and was rapidly approaching the 8,000 followers mark, which contributed to the Fund's enhanced audience reach. The Fund had received media and social media mentions from key climate stakeholders, including UNFCCC, Climate-L, Carbon Brief, non-governmental organizations, and its implementing partners. The Fund's Facebook presence also continued to grow, with some of the more popular posts viewed up to 2,000 times.

103. The focus during the period had been the preparations for the Fund's 10th anniversary. The hallmark of those preparations was a print publication to be released and distributed during the anniversary event, containing 54 stories that included guest and original articles and focused on beneficiaries, showing project impacts and results. The publication would be made available in PDF format on the website. Another website version had been launched a few months earlier to leverage the campaign hashtag #10YearsofAF and make stories easily sharable on social media. Other events for the tenth anniversary included the special anniversary event scheduled for 16 November at the Old Town Hall in Bonn's market square, which would feature high-level international speakers, a photo and video exhibit, poster stands, brochures, live music, sustainable foods catering, and fair trade chocolates with the Fund's logo. Many new special 10th anniversary materials with a special logo were also being developed for distribution at the event and COP.

104. In addition to the special anniversary event, many activities were in preparation for the COP. A micro-website within the larger Fund website had already been launched and would be updated regularly, and an exhibit featuring the 10th anniversary would be in place for throughout the two-week meeting. A side event would be held on 9 November on the theme of environmental and social risk management in adaptation projects, and the Chair of the Board would make a speech at the high-level segment on 16 November. In addition, a "day of direct access entities" would be held in conjunction with other climate funds on 11 November, and, notably, the first annual dialogue of the GCF with other climate funds was scheduled for 14 November. Finally, an Adaptation Fund contributor dialogue was also scheduled, as well as an Adaptation Fund Francophone event with a tentative theme of regional projects.

105. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the presentation on communications and outreach.

Agenda Item 11: Financial issues

a) Financial status of the Trust Fund and CER monetization

106. The representative of the trustee provided an update on the financial status of the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund and monetization of Certified Emission Reductions (CERs), as contained in document AFB/EFC.21/8.

107. The representative of the trustee informed the Board that no new donations had been received since the date of the financial report (document AFB/EFC.21/8).¹ During the fiscal year 2017 which ended 30 June 2017, the trustee transferred US\$ 64.5 million to implementing entities, and US\$ 185.9 million was available for new funding decisions at the fiscal year-end.

108. The representative of the trustee also reported that opportunistic CER sales continued at a modest pace, with USD 0.73 million generated in the first two quarters of 2017. Since 30 June 2017, an additional 22,000 tonnes had been sold, generating approximately USD 0.33 million at an average sale price of approximately US\$ 15 per tonne, which compares favourably to the prevailing market price of approximately EUR 0.20 (20 cents) per tonne.

109. Finally, the trustee reported that the World Bank had also completed and published the fiscal year 2017 Single Audit, which was available on the World Bank's website.

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

b) Report from UNFCCC Secretariat on the UNFCCC's Financial Statements

111. The chair of the EFC drew the Board's attention to document FCCC/SBI/Inf.15 containing the financial report and 2016 audited financial statements for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), issued in preparation for the forty-seventh session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation to be held in early November in Bonn, Germany. Paragraphs 8 and 9 on page 9 of the document referred to unissued CERs amounting to potential revenues of US\$ 43.1 million in 2016. A question had been raised during the twenty-first meeting of the EFC meeting as to whether there had been any resulting impact on the Fund.

112. Two representatives of the UNFCCC Secretariat, Ms. Sana Lingorsky, a programme officer with the UNFCCC Sustainable Development Mechanisms programme, and Mr. Jochen Kress, the financial officer with the Climate Change secretariat who prepared the financial statements for the organization, joined the meeting to explain the matter and respond to the Board's questions. Ms. Lingorsky began by assuring the Board that the issues raised in paragraph 9, which related to the share of proceeds for administration, had no implications on the 2 per cent levy on CERs issued that was transferred to the AFB. She also informed the Board that the second sentence of paragraph 9, which said that the CERs had not been issued, was a factual error arising from an oversight. She went on to explain that under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), once a request for issuance of CERs was processed and approved by the Board, the CERs were issued into the

¹ Two contributions were received during the period from 1 April 2017 to 30 June 2017 and are reported in AFB/EFC.21/8: EUR 5 million from Italy, and EUR 3.25 million from the Walloon Region of Belgium.

pending account of the CDM registry, at which point the 2 per cent levy for the Adaptation Fund was transferred to the related special purpose account. Subsequently, project participants were requested to pay their share of proceeds for administration, which was another, monetary share of proceeds levied on the CERs to fund the administration of the CDM. Project participants gained access to their CERs only after they had settle their share of proceeds for administration. The figure mentioned in paragraph 9 thus referred to that monetary share of proceeds for administration, levied after the share of proceeds for the Adaptation Fund had been transferred, and there was therefore no impact on the total amount of CERs due to the Fund as result of the accounting event.

113. The Adaptation Fund Board took note of the UNFCCC Secretariat's oral report.

Agenda Item 12: Dialogue with civil society organisations

114. The report of the dialogue with civil society is contained in Annex IV to the present report.

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

115. Introducing the item, the Chair recalled that the dates for the meeting 2018 had already been decided. The thirty-first meeting was to be held from 20 to 23 March 2018 in Bonn, Germany, and the thirty-second meeting from 9 to 12 October 2018 in Bonn, Germany.

116. 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 14: Implementation of the code of conduct

117. The Chair drew attention to the code of conduct and the zero tolerance policy for corruption posted on the Fund website and asked whether any member had any issue to raise. No issues were raised.

Agenda Item 15: Other matters

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

118. 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)

Agenda Item 16: Adoption of the report

119. The present report was adopted intersessionally by the Board following its thirtieth meeting.

Agenda Item 17: Closure of the meeting

120. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 5:20 p.m. on 13 October 2017.

ANNEX I

ATTENDANCE AT THE THIRTIETH MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

MEMBERS		
Name	Country	Constituency
Mr. Ibila Djibril	Benin	Africa
Mr. David Kaluba	Zambia	Africa
Mr. Albara E. Tawfiq	Saudi Arabia	Asia-Pacific
Mr. Aram Ter-Zakaryan	Armenia	Eastern Europe
Mr. Lucas Di Pietro Paolo	Argentina	Latin America and the Caribbean
Mr. Victor Viñas	Dominican Republic	Latin America and the Caribbean
Mr. Naresh Sharma	Nepal	Least Developed Countries
Mr. Samuela Lagataki	Fiji	Small Island Developing States
Mr. Hans Olav Ibrek	Norway	Western European and Others Group
Mr. Antonio Navarra	Italy	Western European and Others Group
Mr. Michael Jan Hendrik Kracht	Germany	Annex I Parties
Ms. Tove Zetterström-Goldmann	Sweden	Annex I Parties
Ms. Patience Dampney	Ghana	Non-Annex I Parties
Mr. Charles Mutai	Kenya	Non-Annex I Parties

ALTERNATES		
Name	Country	Constituency
Mr. Mohamed Zmerli	Tunisia	Africa
Mr. Naser Moghaddasi	Iran	Asia-Pacific
Mr. Ahmed Waheed	Maldives	Asia-Pacific
Ms. Umayra Taghiyeva	Azerbaijan	Eastern Europe
Ms. Yadira González Columbié	Cuba	Latin America and the Caribbean
Mr. Philip Weech	Bahamas	Latin America and the Caribbean
Mr. Chebet Maikut	Uganda	Least Developed Countries
Mr. Paul Elreen Phillip	Grenada	Small Island Developing States
Ms. Sylviane Bilgischer	Belgium	Western European and Others Group
Ms. Yuka Greiler	Switzerland	Western European and Others Group
Mr. Marc-Antoine Martin	France	Annex I Parties
Ms. Aida Velasco Munguira	Spain	Annex I Parties
Ms. Margarita Caso Chavez	Mexico	Non-Annex I Parties

ANNEX II**ADOPTED AGENDA OF THE THIRTIETH MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD**

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - a) Adoption of the agenda
 - b) Organization of work.
3. Report on activities of the Chair.
4. Report on activities of the secretariat.
5. Report of the Accreditation Panel.
6. Report of the twenty-first meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) on:
 - a) Report of the secretariat on the intersessional review cycle;
 - b) Overview of project/programme proposals received;
 - c) Project/programme proposals.
7. Report of the twentieth meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) on:
 - a) Annual performance report for the fiscal year 2017;
 - b) Options for an evaluation function and cost implications;
 - c) New annex to the Operational Policies and Guidelines related to project/programme implementation;
 - d) Financial issues;
 - e) Update of the second phase of the overall evaluation of the Fund.
8. Issues remaining from the twenty-ninth meeting:
 - a) Medium-term strategy for the Fund;
 - b) Strategic discussion on objectives and further steps of the Fund. Potential linkages between the Fund and the Green Climate Fund;

- c) Updated Operational Policies and Guidelines to include procedures related to the Readiness Programme;
 - d) Updated results framework of the Readiness Programme.
- 9. Reports of the portfolio monitoring missions to Egypt, Georgia and Turkmenistan.
- 10. Communications and outreach.
- 11. Financial issues:
 - (a) Financial status of the trust fund and CER monetization.
- 12. Dialogue with civil society organizations.
- 13. Implementation of the code of conduct.
- 14. Date and venue of meetings in 2018 and onwards.
- 15. Other matters.
- 16. Adoption of the report.
- 17. Closure of the meeting.

ANNEX III
Revised FY18 budget of the Board and the secretariat

(With the approved increase of US\$ 110,000 for the enhancement of the Financial Intermediary Fund collaboration platform)

All amounts in US\$		Approved	Approved at	Approved
		FY18	AFB30	(Revised)
		FY18	FY18	FY18
BOARD AND SECRETARIAT				
1	Personnel	2,581,250	110,000	2,691,250
2	Travel	402,000		402,000
3	General operations	375,000		375,000
4	Meetings	254,800		254,800
Sub-total secretariat administrative services (a)		3,613,050	110,000	3,723,050
5	Overall evaluation (b)	300,000		300,000
6	Accreditation (c)	473,780		473,780
Sub-total secretariat (a), (b) and (c)		4,386,830	110,000	4,496,830
7	Readiness Programme (d)	604,585		604,585
Sub-total secretariat (a) + (b) + (c) + (d)		4,991,415	110,000	5,101,415

ANNEX IV**DIALOGUE WITH CIVIL SOCIETY, 12 OCTOBER 2017, BONN, GERMANY**

1. The Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board, Mr. Michael Kracht (Germany, Annex I Parties), invited the Board to enter into a dialogue with civil society.
2. Mr. Julio Antonio Carcamo, *Fundación Hondureña de Ambiente y Desarrollo Vida (Fundación Vida)*, reported on *Fundación Vida's* participation in the project in Honduras. That project had supported the design of the national climate change action plan and had been flexible enough to allow for the expansion of its original geographical area, as well as a response to the sudden appearance of the pine weevil in the area. A wide range of entities had participated in the project leading to better institutional empowerment and capacity building. Overall, the final evaluation of the project had found its implementation satisfactory, although its sustainability had been questioned due to socio-economic conditions in Honduras.
3. In response to a query about what a satisfactory evaluation meant, Mr. Carcamo said that in his opinion it could also be expressed as being 85 out of 100. One missing element in the project had been the piloting of such incentives as water pricing. With respect to sustainability he said that it was important for similar projects to focus on working with local governments; by focusing on managing sites at the local level, and investing in local communities and governments, there should be increased responsiveness to issues of local vulnerability. Capacity building was key; investment in new infrastructure required local capacity to sustain those investments. A focus on programmes instead of projects might also help with that.
4. Ms. Julia Grimm, Germanwatch, said that civil society had to be heard before decisions were taken by the Board and its documents made available early enough to allow for comments on them. The observers should also be allowed to take the floor during the discussion of each of the agenda items. The NGO Network supported the draft medium-term strategy of the Fund, although the fundraising target was insufficient. She also said that the project performance reports (PPRs) were an important source of information for civil society, containing a wealth of information about the implementation of projects. However, an analysis of the PPRs uploaded on the Adaptation Fund website showed that 79 per cent of projects were missing one PPR, three were missing two PPRs and one was missing three PPRs.
5. In response to a query about project beneficiaries, she said that local NGOs were the voice of the project beneficiaries and that multi-stakeholder dialogues were organized, the results of which were then fed back to national authorities and the implementing entities. Challenges were faced in commenting on the large project documents and the NGO Network was building the capacity of its members so that they could comment on them. She said, with respect to the risks of accreditation with GCF that the Fund occupied an important niche in the global climate finance architecture and had developed several best practices that others, such as the GCF, could learn from. Accreditation with the GCF could put that at risk. The starting point should not be how to get more resources but

the roles that each fund should fulfil. Accreditation with the GCF might also cause a reduction in pledges as donors could think that the Fund was being funded by GCF. The NGO Network preferred the option of a MOU with the GCF and the development of a new and alternative funding mechanism for the Fund.

6. Mr. Jean Paul Brice Affana, Germanwatch, said that the NGO Network preferred that the long-term evaluation function be performed by an inclusive technical evaluation reference group (TERG) and would be willing to nominate a representative to the TERG. He also reiterated the unique role of the Fund in climate finance, the preference for a MOU with the GCF and the need to develop a new alternative and innovate financial mechanism. More options should be explored and said that the GCF should not absorb the Fund.

7. He also said that the NGO Network had developed a template and guidelines to help NGOs comment on the projects and programmes. He appreciated the support that was being received from the Fund secretariat but said that more time was needed for civil society to comment on the proposals before they were considered by the Board.

8. Two members were open to civil society making interventions on the agenda items. One of the achievements of the Adaptation Fund was that it had such a dialogue with civil society and that under its draft medium-term strategy the Fund would work with the NGO Network to explore the modalities for even greater collaboration with civil society.

9. Ms. Niranjali Amerasinghe and Mr. Joe Thwaites, World Resources Institute (WRI), reported on their organization's recently published report *Future of Funds: Exploring the Architecture of Multilateral Climate Finance*, and described the multilateral climate finance architecture and the inefficiencies existing within it. They said that while the Fund was relatively small it had been quick at approving projects and implementing entities, had a good record of promoting transparency, had a good readiness programme, and had the best record at supporting country ownership through the accreditation of national implementing entities. The comparative advantage of the Fund was in supporting smaller scale adaptation programming. However, given the need for: better coordination between funds, greater harmonization of standards, safeguards and procedures, and a stronger emphasis on programmes, the Fund had three options. It could see its portfolio absorbed by the GCF, arrange for the GCF to delegate to it the management of some of its smaller-scale adaptation portfolio, or find a way for a share of the proceeds from the Paris Agreement's mitigation and sustainable development mechanism to be channelled to it.

10. In response to a query about the feedback received on the report, Mr. Thwaites said that the different funds had been consulted when preparing the report and that the draft report had been circulated for them to review. In response to a query about reviewing bilateral funds he said that they were ripe for research using the same methodology used in the WRI report.

11. In response to a query about the Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT) Ms. Amerasinghe said that it had been created too late for inclusion in the report. She said that there

were many ways to think about linkages with the GCF such as greater harmonization on readiness, or fast-tracking the scaling up of micro projects piloted by the Fund.

12. It was observed that there was much useful information in the WRI report pertaining to the Fund and that time should be set aside to discuss it. It should also be circulated to others such as those evaluating the Fund. The recommendations could inspire the Fund on its strategy, especially for the different options suggested for linkages with the GCF.

13. The Chair thanked those members of civil society in attendance for their presentations.

ANNEX V

AFB 30 Project Funding Decisions October 13, 2017

	Country/Title	IE	Document Ref	Project	NIE	RIE	MIE	Set-aside Funds	Decision
1. Projects and Programmes: Single-country									
	Micronesia (F. S. of)	MCT	AFB/PPRC.21/18	970,000	970,000				Not approved
	Cook Islands	MFEM	AFB/PPRC.21/19	2,999,125	2,999,125				Not approved
	Namibia (1)	DRFN	AFB/PPRC.21/20	4,999,386	4,999,386				Not approved
	Namibia (2)	DRFN	AFB/PPRC.21/21	4,999,674	4,999,674			4,999,674	Approved
	Ecuador	CAF	AFB/PPRC.21/22	2,489,373		2,489,373			Not approved
	Guinea Bissau	BOAD	AFB/PPRC.21/23	9,979,000		9,979,000		9,979,000	Approved
	Togo	BOAD	AFB/PPRC.21/24	10,000,000		10,000,000			Not approved
	Fiji	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.21/25	4,235,995			4,235,995	4,235,995	Approved
	Iraq	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.21/26	9,999,660			9,999,660		Not approved
	Solomon Islands	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.21/27	4,395,877			4,395,877	4,395,877	Approved
Sub-total				55,068,090	13,968,185	22,468,373	18,631,532	23,610,546	
2. Project Formulation Grants: Single country									
	Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/5/Add.1	30,000	30,000				Not approved
	Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/6/Add.1	30,000	30,000			30,000	Approved
	Indonesia (3)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/7/Add.1	30,000	30,000				Not approved
	Indonesia (4)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/8/Add.1	30,000	30,000				Not approved
	Indonesia (5)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/9/Add.1	30,000	30,000				Not approved
	Indonesia (6)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/10/Add.1	30,000	30,000				Not approved
	Armenia (1)	EPIU	AFB/PPRC.21/11/Add.1	27,000	27,000			27,000	Approved
	Armenia (2)	EPIU	AFB/PPRC.21/12/Add.1	30,000	30,000				Not approved
	Indonesia (7)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/13/Add.1	30,000	30,000			30,000	Approved

Sub-total				267,000	267,000			87,000	
3. Concepts: Single-country									
	Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/5	998,878	998,878				Not endorsed
	Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/6	905,109	905,109				Endorsed
	Indonesia (3)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/7	946,287	946,287				Not endorsed
	Indonesia (4)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/8	990,000	990,000				Not endorsed
	Indonesia (5)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/9	589,975	589,975				Not endorsed
	Indonesia (6)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/10	1,000,000	1,000,000				Not endorsed
	Armenia (1)	EPIU	AFB/PPRC.21/11	1,435,100	1,435,100				Endorsed
	Armenia (2)	EPIU	AFB/PPRC.21/12	2,506,000	2,506,000				Not endorsed
	Indonesia (7)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.21/13	4,169,993	4,169,993				Endorsed
	Chad	OSS	AFB/PPRC.21/14	9,600,000		9,600,000			Not endorsed
	Cambodia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.21/15	5,000,000			5,000,000		Endorsed
	Cote d'Ivoire	AfDB	AFB/PPRC.21/16	9,866,905			9,866,905		Not endorsed
	Mongolia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.21/17	4,500,000			4,500,000		Endorsed
Sub-total				42,508,247	13,541,342	9,600,000	19,366,905		
4. Projects and Programmes: Regional									
	Chile, Ecuador	CAF	AFB/PPRC.21/36	13,910,400		13,910,400			Not approved
	Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand, Vietnam	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.21/37	4,898,775			4,898,775		Not approved
Sub-total				18,809,175		13,910,400	4,898,775		
5. Project Formulation Grants: Regional Concepts									
	Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.21/34/Add.1	80,000			80,000	80,000	Approved
Sub-total				80,000			80,000	80,000	

6. Concepts: Regional									
	Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.21/34	4,969,367			4,969,367		Endorsed
	Thailand, Vietnam	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.21/35	7,000,000			7,000,000		Endorsed
Sub-total				1,969,367			11,969,367		
7. Project Formulation Grants: Regional Pre-concept									
	Burkina Faso, Mali	OSS	AFB/PPRC.21/29/Add.1	20,000		20,000			Not approved
	Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda	OSS	AFB/PPRC.21/30/Add.1	20,000		20,000		20,000	Approved
	Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea	AfDB	AFB/PPRC.21/32/Add.1	20,000			20,000	20,000	Approved
	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, Togo	WMO	AFB/PPRC.21/33/Add.1	20,000			20,000	20,000	Approved
Sub-total				80,000		40,000	40,000	60,000	
8. Pre-concepts: Regional									
	Argentina, Uruguay	CAF	AFB/PPRC.21/28	13,999,997		13,999,997			Endorsed
	Burkina Faso, Mali	OSS	AFB/PPRC.21/29	4,790,000		4,790,000			Not endorsed
	Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda	OSS	AFB/PPRC.21/30	12,990,000		12,990,000			Endorsed
	Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.21/31	14,000,000			14,000,000		Endorsed
	Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea	AfDB	AFB/PPRC.21/32	14,000,000			14,000,000		Endorsed
	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, Togo	WMO	AFB/PPRC.21/33	7,920,000			7,920,000		Endorsed
Sub-total				67,699,997		31,779,997	35,920,000		
9. Total (9 = 1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5+6+7+8)				196,481,876	27,776,527	77,798,770	90,906,579	23,837,546	