



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/B.33/15

26 June 2019

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

Thirty-third Meeting

Bonn, Germany, 14-15 March 2019

REPORT OF THE THIRTY-THIRD MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD

Introduction

1. The thirty-third meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) was held at the Langer Eugen United Nations Campus in Bonn, Germany, from 12 to 15 March 2019, in conjunction with the twenty-fourth 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 in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (UNCCD). The UNCCD secretariat 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 to the present report as Annex I. A list of accredited observers present at the meeting can be found in document AFB/B.33/Inf.3

Agenda Item 1: Opening of the meeting

4. The meeting was opened 9:00 a.m. on 12 March 2019 by the outgoing Vice-Chair Ms. Sylviane Bilgischer (Belgium, Annex I Parties) to take up agenda item 2 and elect the remaining officers of the EFC, the PPRC and the Accreditation Panel.
5. The meeting was the suspended and reconvened on the morning of 13 March 2019.
6. The meeting was suspended again and reconvened on the morning of 14 March 2019 by the outgoing Chair, Mr. Victor Viñas (Dominican Republic, Latin America and the Caribbean) who congratulated the new Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the PPRC and EFC, and the Vice-Chair of the Accreditation Panel on their election.

Agenda item 2: Election of outstanding officers.

7. The Board elected the following officers.

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

8. The Adaptation Fund Board decided to elect:

- a) Ms. Sheida Asgharzadeh Ghahroudi (Islamic Republic of Iran, Asia-Pacific) as Chair of the Ethics and Finance Committee;
- b) Mr. Mattias Broman (Sweden, Annex I Parties) as Vice-Chair of the Ethics and Finance Committee;
- c) Mr. Patrick Sieber (Switzerland, Annex I Parties) as Chair of the Project and Programme Review Committee; and
- d) Mr. Lucas di Pietro (Argentina, Latin America and the Caribbean) as Vice-Chair of the Project and Programme Review Committee; and
- e) Ms. Eleonora Cogo (Italy, Western Europe and Others) as the Vice-Chair of the Accreditation Panel.

(Decision B.33/1)

b) Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG)

9. The Adaptation Fund Board decided to elect the following Board members and alternates as members of the Recruitment Working Group of the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund (AF-TERG) established through decision B.31/25:

- a) Mr. Ibila Djibril (Benin, Africa);
- b) Mr. Chebet Maikut (Uganda, Least Developed Countries);
- c) Mr. Mirza Shawkat Ali (Bangladesh, Asia-Pacific);
- d) Mr. Victor Viñas (Dominican Republic, Latin America and the Caribbean); and
- e) Mr. Marc-Antoine Martin (France, Annex I Parties).

(Decision B.33/2)

c) Multilateral Implementing Entity (MIE) Aggregator Task Force

10. The Adaptation Fund Board decided to elect the following Board members and alternates as members of the Multilateral Implementing Entity (MIE) Aggregator Task Force established through decision B.32/5:

- a) Mr. Evans Njewa (Malawi, Non-Annex I Parties);

- b) Mr. Ahmed Waheed (Maldives, Asia-Pacific);
- c) Mr. Charles Mutai (Kenya, Non-Annex I Parties); and
- d) Ms. Yadira Gonzalez (Cuba, Latin America and the Caribbean).

(Decision B.33/3)

d) *Resource Mobilization Task Force*

11. The Adaptation Fund Board decided to elect the following Board members and alternates as members of the Resource Mobilization Task Force:

- a) Mr. Albara E. Tawfiq (Saudi Arabia, Asia-Pacific);
- b) Mr. Lucas di Pietro (Argentina, Latin America and the Caribbean);
- c) Mr. Aram Ter-Zakaryan (Armenia, Eastern Europe);
- d) Mr. David Kaluba (Zambia, Africa);
- e) Mr. Marc-Antoine Martin (France, Annex I Parties); and
- f) Ms. Sylviane Bilgischer (Belgium, Annex I Parties).

(Decision B.33/4)

Agenda Item 3: Transition of the Chair and Vice-Chair

12. The outgoing Chair recalled that at its thirty-second meeting the Board had elected the outgoing Vice-Chair as the new Chair of the Board and he invited the new Chair to take up the chairmanship of the Board. He also congratulated the new Vice-Chair on his election at the present meeting.

Agenda Item 4: Organizational matters

a) *Adoption of the agenda*

13. The Board adopted the provisional agenda as contained in document AFB/B.33/1. The agenda is attached as Annex II to the present report.

14. In adopting the agenda, the Board agreed to discuss the following matters under agenda item 8, Other matters:

- a) The quorum of the Board;
- b) Amending the rules of procedure to allow the election of temporary officers;
- c) The time allowed for the meeting of the PPRC and the management of its agenda;
- d) Membership in the standing bodies of the Board; and

- e) The participation of civil society in the activities of the Board.

b) *Organization of work*

15. The Board considered the provisional timetable contained in the annotated provisional agenda (AFB/B.33/2) and adopted it as amended by the Chair. In view of the heavy agenda she proposed that the Board consider the issues arising from fourteenth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 14), and the third part of the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 1-3), agenda item 15, immediately following the report of the twenty-fourth meeting of the EFC, agenda item 9. After that the Board would engage in its dialogue with civil society organizations, agenda item 18, which would be followed by the report of the twenty-fourth meeting of the PPRC, agenda item 8.

16. The Chair welcomed the following new members and alternates:

- Mr. Philip Weech (Bahamas, Latin America and the Caribbean);
- Ms. Eleonora Cogo (Italy, Western European and Others Group);
- Ms. Susana Castro-Acuña (Spain, Western European and Others Group);
- Ms. Claudia Keller (Germany, Western European and Others Group);
- Mr. Nilesh Prakash (Fiji, Small Island Developing States);
- Mr. Mattias Broman (Sweden, Annex I Parties); and
- Mr. Evans Njewa (Malawi, Non-Annex I Parties).

17. The Chair reminded the new members and alternates that they were required to sign the Oath of Service and asked for declarations of any conflict of interest. She said that if any conflict of interest arose in relation to the closed session on the report of the Accreditation Panel the declarations of conflict of interest should be made at that time. The following members and alternates declared conflicts of interest:

- Mr. Ibila Djibril (Benin, Africa);
- Mr. Aram Ter-Zakaryan (Armenia, Eastern Europe);
- Mr. Chebet Maikut (Uganda, Least Developed Countries);
- Mr. Evans Njewa (Malawi, Non-Annex I Parties);
- Mr. Victor Viñas (Dominican Republic, Latin America and the Caribbean); and
- Ms. Sheida Asgharzadeh Ghahroudi (Islamic Republic of Iran, Asia-Pacific).

18. In the discussion that followed clarification was sought as to the scope of the rules on the conflict of interest. One member pointed out that the members and alternates had been elected by their constituencies and not by their countries, and asked whether the members and alternates ought to leave the meeting room when issues related to their country were also being discussed.

19. The manager of the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat (the secretariat) explained that pursuant to Decision B.17/23, the code of conduct, and the rules on conflict of interest outlined in Section VII of the rules of procedure of the Board, it is required that members having an actual, or perceived, conflict of interest had to be absent during the deliberations on recommendations or decisions related to proposals for funding and any other matters that related to that conflict of interest. The practice of the Board had been that members and alternates had to be absent when issues related to their own country were being discussed.

20. The Chair said given the heavy agenda, the issue could not be given further consideration at the present meeting.

Agenda Item 5: Report on the activities of the Chair

21. The outgoing Chair provided a brief report on the activities he had undertaken on the Board's behalf during the intersessional period, with the support of the secretariat, which are more fully described in document AFB/B.33/Inf.6.

22. The outgoing Chair said that during the intersessional period he had carried out a number of activities for the Fund including: the finalization of the report of the thirty-second meeting of the Board, and representing the Board at the Katowice Climate Change Conference, which included delivering the report of the Board to the CMP 14. Other activities involved representing the Board: at the second Annual Dialogue of Climate Funds organized by the Green Climate Fund (GCF), at the Adaptation Fund Contributor Dialogue, and at the Ecuador/Chile Regional Project signing ceremony. He had also fostered the outreach of the Fund by representing the Board at the "Second International Conference on Climate Finance", in Dhaka, Bangladesh, 9-10 March, and by providing an audio interview for a podcast news story produced by the secretariat in both English and Spanish about a project in Colombia and Fund's value in providing concrete, scalable actions to vulnerable communities and countries.

23. The Board took note of the report on the activities of the Chair.

Agenda Item 6: Report on the activities of the secretariat

24. The manager of the secretariat reported on the secretariat's activities during the intersessional period as set out in document AFB/B.33/3. He mentioned that by the end of the Katowice Climate Change Conference the Fund had reached its highest ever annual result in resource mobilization, with total US\$ 129 million in pledges and contributions, and that as of 1 January 2019 the Fund had started to formally serve the Paris Agreement. He also said that a record number of 40 project proposals, totalling approximately US\$ 270 million in funding requests had been received for consideration at the current meeting. In addition to its regular work, during the reporting period, the secretariat participated in, and presented at a number of events and meetings which are listed in its written report.

25. With respect to the Katowice Climate Change Conference, the secretariat organized three well-attended side-events and had also organized, together with the GCF secretariat, a

side-event on Empowering Direct Access to Climate Finance. The secretariat had arranged a contributor dialogue, featuring a number of distinguished opening speakers, which had been opened to the public for the first time and was very successful. The manager of the secretariat had also participated in a high-level opening session of Adaptation Day as well as in a side-event on exploring innovative approaches to strengthen capacity on Direct Access to Climate Finance, organized by the Asian Institute of Technology, BCAS Bangladesh and Indigo. With the Government of Italy, the secretariat had also arranged a press conference that focused on synergies between the Italian Ministry of Environment and the Fund through replicating successful adaptation models in Ethiopia.

26. As mandated by the Board, the secretariat, together with the GCF Secretariat, had organized an informal bilateral meeting between members of their respective Boards, including the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board, and the co-chairs of the GCF Board. The secretariat had also had several meetings with ministers and heads of delegations from both contributor and recipient governments and had met with 12 applicant National Implementing Entities (NIEs) in relation to their ongoing accreditation and reaccreditation processes, and with nine new potential applicants. In support of the readiness programme it had organized the seventh readiness webinar, held on 25 October 2018, which had discussed project implementation and managing change in adaptation projects and programmes.

27. Under guidance by the Recruitment Working Group for the Fund's Technical Evaluation Reference Group (AF-TERG), the secretariat had completed the selection process of the Chair of the AF-TERG, and the Board had approved an intersessional decision appointing Ms. Eva Lithman to that position.

28. Ms. Eva Lithman introduced herself to the Board and explained different approaches to evaluations. She also explained how the AF-TERG would operate, its three functions (evaluation, advisory and oversight), as described in its terms of reference, and that its work would be supported by a dedicated secretariat team.

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

Agenda Item 7: Report of the Accreditation Panel

30. The Vice-Chair of the Accreditation Panel (the Panel), Mr. Chebet Maikut (Uganda, Least Developed Countries) presented the report of the Panel's thirtieth meeting (document AFB/B.33/4), held in January 2019, including an overview on the status of accreditation and reaccreditation issues, the Panel's recommendations on accreditation and re-accreditation and a draft decision prepared by the secretariat for consideration by the Board. He highlighted that the total number of accredited implementing entities amounted to 46: 28 NIEs, six Regional Implementing Entities (RIES), and 12 Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs). Among 28 NIEs, there were seven accredited NIEs that were from Least Developed Countries and six accredited NIEs that were from Small Islands Developing States.

31. Following his report, the meeting went into a closed session for a discussion of the individual applications for accreditation and re-accreditation due to the potentially confidential information related to the applications.

32. Following the closed session, the Adaptation Fund Board took note of the report. approved the following decisions.

a) *Fast-track re-accreditation of the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) as National Implementing Entity*

33. Having considered the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, and following the fast-track re-accreditation process approved by the Board through Decision B.28/38, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to re-accredit the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) as a National Implementing Entity (NIE) of the Adaptation Fund for five years, as per paragraph 38 of the operational policies and guidelines for Parties to access resources from the Adaptation Fund. The re-accreditation expiration date is 14 March 2024.

(Decision B.33/5)

b) *Fast-track re-accreditation of the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) as Regional Implementing Entity*

34. Having considered the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel and following the fast-track re-accreditation process approved by the Board through Decision B.28/38, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to re-accredit the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) as a Regional Implementing Entity (RIE) of the Adaptation Fund for five years, as per paragraph 38 of the operational policies and guidelines for Parties to access resources from the Adaptation Fund. The re-accreditation expiration date is 14 March 2024.

(Decision B.33/6)

c) *Fast-track re-accreditation of the Ministry of Environment of Rwanda (formerly the Ministry of Natural Resources of Rwanda) as National Implementing Entity*

35. Having considered the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel and following the fast-track re-accreditation process approved by the Board through Decision B.38/28, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to re-accredit the Ministry of Environment of Rwanda (formerly the Ministry of Natural Resources of Rwanda) as a National Implementing Entity (NIE) of the Adaptation Fund for five years, as per paragraph 38 of the operational policies and guidelines for Parties to access resources from the Adaptation Fund. The re-accreditation expiration date is 14 March 2024.

(Decision B.33/7)

d) *Accreditation of the Ministry of Water and Environment of Uganda as National Implementing Entity*

36. Having considered the recommendation of the Accreditation Panel, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to accredit the Ministry of Water and Environment of Uganda as a National Implementing Entity (NIE) of the Adaptation Fund for five years, as per paragraph 38 of the operational policies and guidelines for Parties to access resources from the Adaptation Fund. The accreditation expiration date is 14 March 2024.

(Decision B.33/8)

e) *Agencia Nacional de Investigación e Innovación (ANII)*

37. Having considered the Report of the Accreditation Panel contained in Document AFB.B.33/4, the Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- a) To take note of the information regarding the accreditation status of the *Agencia Nacional de Investigación e Innovación* (ANII) of Uruguay, a National Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund, which was accredited on 17 September 2010 and has not submitted its re-accreditation application as at 15 October 2018, and the implications of the re-accreditation policy of the Adaptation Fund approved by decision B.31/1 on the project implemented by ANII; and
- b) To request the secretariat:
 - (i) To prepare a possible revision of re-accreditation policy, in collaboration with the Accreditation Panel, that would take into account its implication on the implementing entities' ongoing project implementation;
 - (ii) To review the implications of an implementing entity's accreditation expiration on its project implementation and the standard legal agreement signed between the Board and the implementing entity; and
 - (iii) To prepare a document which contains the outcome of the work referred to in subparagraphs (b) (i) and (ii) and present it to the Board for consideration at its thirty-fourth meeting; and
- c) To request the secretariat to send, before expiry of its accreditation, an official letter to the Designated Authority with a request of official communication on the interest of the national implementing entity in pursuing re-accreditation.

(Decision B.33/9)

Agenda Item 8: Report of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC)

38. Mr. Patrick Sieber (Switzerland, Annex I Parties) as Chair of the PPRC presented the committee's recommendations (AFB/PPRC.24/48). The PPRC had met for two days and had an additional session on the first day of the Board meeting. It had welcomed three new members: Ms. Claudia Keller, Ms. Susana Castro-Acuña and Mr. Evans Njewa, as well as Mr. Philip Weech, who for this meeting had kindly agreed to join the PPRC to ensure it met the rules on quorum.

39. During its deliberations the PPRC had considered: 25 proposals for single-country projects, which included 10 concepts and 15 fully-developed proposals; and 7 proposals for regional projects, which included 1 pre-concept, 1 concept and 5 fully-developed proposals. It had also considered a number of issues that had arisen during the review process, and had made two recommendations. The first was to consider establishing a list of wait-listed projects and programmes for approval, subject to the availability of funds, and in the order in which they were prioritized on the wait-list. The second recommendation was to include in the work plan for fiscal year 2020 the provision for an amount of US\$ 60 million, provisionally consisting of up to US\$ 59 million for the funding of regional project and programme proposals and up to US\$ 1 million for the funding of project formulation grant requests.

40. The PPRC had recalled the issue that had been brought to their attention by the secretariat at the previous Board meeting about the challenges faced by multilateral development banks related to the Fund's legal agreement, and was informed a representative of the secretariat that the issue would be addressed under agenda item 14 b) of the present meeting.

41. Following the consideration of the projects and programmes, the secretariat had presented document AFB/PPRC.24/44 on the initial screening and technical review of project scale-up grant proposals, but the PPRC had deferred discussion on the matter due to lack of time.

42. During the Board's discussion of the recommendations of the PPRC it was suggested that recommendations PPRC.24/2, PPRC.24/3 and PPRC.24/36 ought to be considered together. Clarification was sought on why the proposal for Bangladesh (PPRC.24/9) was being recommended for conditional approval while the similar proposal for Saint Lucia (PPRC.24/8) had not been recommended for approval. It was also asked whether the NIE for Uruguay was involved in the regional project for Argentina and Uruguay (PPRC.24/29), whether countries could escape the country cap by being part of a regional project, and why the regional projects needed to be put on a waitlist when there seemed to be sufficient funding available at the present meeting to fund them all. However, concern was also expressed at the amount of funding that had gone to the MIEs, and that this could undercut the work of the NIEs, and the direct access modality, which were the core values of the Fund. An explanation was requested as to why MIEs were also being awarded project formulation grants.

43. The Chair of the PPRC said that the difference between the projects for Bangladesh and Saint Lucia was that for the former the required information was available but had simply not been presented in the format required by the Fund while for the latter some of the required information was still missing. The manager of the secretariat explained that under the regional project and programme funding window all implementing entities, including MIEs, could be awarded project formulation grants. He also said that because the funding window had been specifically designed as a cap on funding regional projects and programmes, as matters now stood it would not be possible to fund those proposals from other funds held by the Fund. The proposed waitlist had been guided by the Board's previous solution to the problem of having insufficient funding available for all the projects being recommended for approval. He clarified that the NIE for Uruguay was not involved in the regional project for Argentina and Uruguay. The Chair reminded the Board that the issue of the country cap would be addressed under another agenda item.

44. There was no consensus on recommendation PPRC.24/37 to consider intersessionally the technical review of innovation grant (documents AFB/PPRC.24/42 and AFB/PPRC.24/43), scale-up grant (document AFB/PPRC.24/45) and learning grant (document AFB/PPRC.24/47) proposals.

a) Report of the secretariat on initial screening/technical review of project and programme proposals

Issues Identified During the Review Process

Review of the project and programme review process

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

- a) Request the secretariat to undertake a review of the project and programme review process, with the consideration of the Operational Policies and Guidelines for Parties to Access Resources from the Adaptation Fund, and present it at the thirty-fourth meeting of the Board.

(Decision B.33/10)

Waitlisted projects and programmes

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

- a) To, in case there would be a need to establish a waitlist with regional projects/programmes that are recommended for approval by the PPRC but could not be immediately funded, consider the waitlisted projects/programmes for approval, subject to the availability of funds, at a future Board meeting, or intersessionally, in the order in which they are prioritized on the waitlist.

(Decision B.33/11)

Financing window for regional projects and programmes for fiscal year 2020

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

- a) To include in its work plan for fiscal year 2020 the provision for an amount of US\$ 60 million to be provisionally set aside, as follows:
- (i) Up to US\$ 59 million for the funding of regional project and programme proposals; and
 - (ii) Up to US\$ 1 million for the funding of project formulation grant requests for preparing regional project and programme concept or fully-developed project documents.

(Decision B.33/12)

b) *Review of single-country project and programme proposals*

Fully-developed proposals*Proposals from National Implementing Entities (NIEs)**Small-size proposals:*

Indonesia (1): Community Adaptation for Forest-Food Based Management in Saddang Watershed Ecosystem (Fully-developed Project Document; Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan); IDN/NIE/Food/2017/1; US\$ 835,465)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;

- b) 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 total duration of the project needs to be revised, to allow considerable time for the completion of the proposed activities, specifically increasing forest land cover and increase community income through the creation of businesses and food diversification;
 - (ii) The proponent should consider elaborating an Environmental and Social Management Plan, particularly on issues of marginalized and vulnerable people and gender equity. In addition, a gender assessment, in line with the Fund's Gender Policy, should be provided;
 - (iii) The proposal needs to include a description of a grievance mechanism, which is accessible to employees and affected communities. This section should describe arrangements for how the grievance mechanism will be designed to receive and facilitate grievances in a transparent manner; and
- c) Request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Indonesia.

(Decision B.33/13)

Regular proposals:

Armenia (1): Strengthening land-based adaptation capacity in communities adjacent to protected areas in Armenia (Fully-developed Project Document; Environmental Project Implementation Unit (EPIU) of the Ministry of Nature Protection of Armenia; ARM/NIE/Forest/2017/1; US\$ 2,506,000)

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

- a) Approve the fully-developed project, 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) Approve the funding of US\$ 2,506,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by EPIU; and
- c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with EPIU as the national implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.33/14)

Dominican Republic: Enhancing Climate Resilience in San Cristóbal Province, Dominican Republic - Integrated Water Resources Management and Rural Development Programme (Fully-developed Project Document; Dominican Institute of Integral Development (IDDI); DOM/NIE/Water/2016/1; US\$ 9,953,692)

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

- a) Approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Dominican Institute of Integral Development (IDDI) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Approve the funding of US\$ 9,953,692 for the implementation of the project, as requested by IDDI; and
- c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with IDDI as the national implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.33/15)

Indonesia (2): Building Coastal City Resilience to Climate Change Impacts and Natural Disasters in Pekalongan City, Central Java Province (Fully-developed Project Document; Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan); IDN/NIE/Multi/2017/1; US\$ 4,127,065)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) 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 provide the necessary assessments for compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) of the Fund;
 - (ii) The proposal should further demonstrate how the programme interventions would meet national legislation regarding Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), since program activities do not appear to be "cultivation" activities in substance and are thus not likely to benefit from national EIAs exemptions;
 - (iii) The proposal should include evidences of consultations with local communities, financial institutions and land-owners that will be targeted by mangrove restoration activities and demonstrate that the outcomes of such consultations (interests and concerns of stakeholders) are reflected in the design of the interventions;

- (iv) The proposal should provide evidence of local governments' commitments to maintain and finance the programme outcomes (embankments, eco-tourism, latrines, mangroves) after programme closure; and
- c) Request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Indonesia.

(Decision B.33/16)

Proposals from Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs)

Regular proposals

Saint Lucia: Building Resilience for Adaptation to Climate Change and Climate Variability in Agriculture in Saint Lucia (Fully-developed Project Document; Caribbean Development Bank (CDB); LCA/NIE/Agric/2019/1; US\$ 9,858,570)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) To suggest that CDB 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 a gender assessment that is in line with the Gender Policy of the Adaptation Fund;
 - (ii) The proponent should provide further details and an improved screen of environmental and social risks and impacts, in particular in relation to access and equity and marginalized and vulnerable people;
 - (iii) The proponent should elaborate on synergies with other projects, knowledge management, financial sustainability and implementation arrangements; and
- c) To request CDB to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Saint Lucia.

(Decision B.33/17)

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Regular proposals

Bangladesh: Adaptation Initiative for climate vulnerable offshore small islands and riverine charland in Bangladesh (Fully-developed Project Document; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); BGD/MIE/DRR/2019/1; US\$ 9,995,369)

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

- a) Approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Approve the funding of US\$ 9,995,369 for the implementation of the project, as requested by UNDP; and
- c) To request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UNDP as the multilateral implementing entity for the project. The agreement should include a commitment from UNDP that, prior to first disbursement, UNDP will submit the revised environmental and social risk identification and analysis in the format complying with the environmental and social policy and gender policy of the Fund.

(Decision B.33/18)

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

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed 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) 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 clarify how support will be provided for climate-informed community decision making on adaptation interventions in the future, either through this or other initiatives;
 - (ii) The proposal should ensure that the environmental and social risks identification and management process for the identified adaptation measures is clearly outlined in the environmental and social management plan of the project, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund; and

- c) Request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Cambodia.

(Decision B.33/19)

Georgia: Dairy Modernization and Market Access: Adaptation Component (DiMMAadapt) (Fully-developed Project Document; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); GEO/MIE/Agric/2019/1; US\$ 4,644,794)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Suggest that IFAD 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 compliance with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy (GP);
 - (ii) The proponent should include measures for the management of environmental and social risks in line with the Adaptation Fund ESP and GP;
 - (iii) The proposal should elaborate more on a management response should the heads of cattle rise; and
- c) Request IFAD to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Georgia.

(Decision B.33/20)

Iran, Islamic Republic of: Reducing vulnerability to climate change in the Lake Bakhtegan Basin (Fully-developed Project Document; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); IRN/MIE/Water/2018/1; US\$ 9,865,651)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Suggest that UNDP 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 the process through which the project benefits will be distributed among the target villages' beneficiaries,

including the criteria that will be used to select them, in line with the Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy;

- (ii) The proposal should explain how the project will meet relevant national standards (notably environmental assessments, building codes and any other relevant standards) that would apply to the project interventions;
 - (iii) The proposal should clarify for all relevant initiatives identified (including the Women Trust Fund), areas of overlap and complementarity, describe their lessons learned, and explain how they were taken into account in the design of the project activities;
 - (iv) The proposal should describe the governance arrangements for the project, including the grievance mechanism;
 - (v) The proposal should explain the rationale for not fully identifying the activities of components 2 and 3 and reflect this in the implementation schedule and the detailed budget;
 - (vi) The proposal should identify and manage environmental and social risks in line with the ESP of the Adaptation Fund; and
- c) Request UNDP to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

(Decision B.33/21)

Lao People's Democratic Republic: Building climate and disaster resilience capacities of vulnerable small towns in Lao PDR (Fully-developed Project Document; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); LAO/MIE/DRR/2018/1; US\$ 5,500,000)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Suggest that UN-Habitat 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 that comprehensive environmental and social impact assessments have taken place for the dam and intake structures for the two water treatment plants and related infrastructures, to ensure that all adverse impacts are fully identified and mitigated in project design, as well as managed and monitored in an Environmental and Social Management Plan;
 - (ii) The proposal should include a comprehensive Gender Assessment specific to the project and target area;

- (iii) The financial sustainability of the project and the infrastructure and services it will create is not clear and should be demonstrated in the proposal; and
- c) Request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Lao People's Democratic Republic.

(Decision B.33/22)

Lesotho: Improving adaptive capacity of vulnerable and food-insecure populations in Lesotho (Fully-developed Project Document; The World Food Programme (WFP); LSO/MIE/Food/2018/1; US\$ 9,999,891)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the World Food Programme (WFP) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Suggest that WFP 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 further inform the sustainability and cost-effectiveness of the Forecast-based Financing (FbF) approach;
 - (ii) A comprehensive Environmental and Social Policy screening, in line with the Adaptation Fund policy, is necessary, as is a fully developed grievance mechanism;
 - (iii) The Monitoring and Evaluation costs should be revised, in accordance with the Adaptation Fund guidelines;
 - (iv) The proposal should specify, quantifying where possible, the benefits of the intervention on food security;
 - (v) The proposal should show how the outcomes of the district and community level consultations have been reflected in the project design; and
- c) Request WFP to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Lesotho.

(Decision B.33/23)

Sierra Leone: Promoting climate resilience in the cocoa and rice sectors as an adaptation strategy in Sierra Leone (Fully-developed Project Document; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); SLE/MIE/Multi/2018/1/PD; US\$ 9,916,925)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made by the technical review; and
- b) To suggest that IFAD 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 fully-developed proposal should include the table on core impact indicators; a revised Environmental and Social Management Plan clearly mentioning the mitigation measures, significance, management and responsibility for the specific principle that may be triggered and a disbursement schedule presenting the planned outputs under each sub-component per year of implementation;
 - (ii) The fully-developed proposal should clearly list all indicative activities for each component in the project financing table;
 - (iii) The fully-developed proposal should clearly identify the specific national technical standards the project will comply with during the implementation of all planned activities, where relevant;
 - (iv) The fully-developed proposal should clearly highlight the synergies/complementarity with existing initiatives and specify the types of activities, partners and the basis for continuation or upscaling efforts;
 - (v) The fully-developed proposal should include relevant knowledge management outputs that have been budgeted under sub-component 3.2;
 - (vi) The fully-developed proposal should clarify the outcomes of the consultative process, concerns raised by the target group, including the involvement of local women's group, and how they have been taken into consideration in the design of project interventions; and
- c) To request IFAD to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) above to the Government of Sierra Leone.

(Decision B.33/24)

Tajikistan: An integrated landscape approach to enhancing the climate resilience of small-scale farmers and pastoralists in Tajikistan (Fully-developed Project Document; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); TJK/MIE/Rural/2018/1; US\$ 9,996,441)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the request made by the technical review;

- b) To suggest that UNDP 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 fully-developed proposal should submit a revised Environmental and Social Policy risk identification analysis including the significance of the risk identified (e.g. low, medium, high), the outcome of the screening process indicating the risks that may be triggered, as well the relevant environment and social assessments in compliance with the Adaptation Fund Environmental and Social Policy principles;
 - (ii) Since the priority list of ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) sub-projects that constitute over US\$ 6 million of the budget have been identified, the assessments mentioned in Section V, Annex 4 (gender analysis, marginalized and vulnerable groups assessment, ecological and land use assessment, pasture use assessment and other relevant assessments) should be submitted along with the resubmitted proposal; and
- c) To request UNDP to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Tajikistan.

(Decision B.33/25)

Turkmenistan: Scaling Climate Resilience for Farmers in Turkmenistan (Fully-developed Project Document; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); TKM/MIE/Agric/2018/1; US\$ 7,000,040)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Suggest that UNDP 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 include a process of complying with relevant national technical standards for the unidentified sub-projects;
 - (ii) The proponent should clarify in the proposal, how the risks and impacts identification complies with the requirements of the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy, and update the safeguards process of the Environmental and Social Management Framework accordingly; and
- c) Request UNDP to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Turkmenistan.

(Decision B.33/26)

Uganda: Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation of Small Towns and Peri-Urban Communities
(Fully-developed Project Document; African Development Bank (AfDB); UGA/MIE/Water/2018/1;
US\$ 2,249,000)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the African Development Bank (AfDB) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) 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 proponent should provide adequate identification and technical details of the proposed concrete activities and infrastructure to be installed;
 - (ii) The proponent should provide justification why a comprehensive baseline study will only be done at project inception and cannot be undertaken and submitted together with the fully developed project proposal document;
 - (iii) The proposal should provide clarification on the sustainability of project outcomes and in particular, provide justification for why the proposed memoranda of understanding with district and local governments cannot be initiated currently for the initial outcomes from such discussions to be presented together with the fully developed project document;
 - (iv) The proposal should provide consistent and gender-disaggregated data on project beneficiaries and include women beneficiaries in the results framework in a manner consistent with the disaggregated data;
 - (v) The proponent should undertake a comprehensive screening and assessment of environmental and social risks and submit together with the fully developed project document a comprehensive environmental and social impact assessment and environmental and social management plan that fully assesses the risk of involuntary resettlement and potential undertaking of project activities within the boundaries of the national park in the Atari river catchment;
 - (vi) The knowledge management plan should be revisited and strengthened with specific information relating to knowledge-sharing at the community level;
 - (vii) The budget should show grand total figures for the annual disbursements; and
- c) Request AfDB to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Uganda.

(Decision B.33/27)

Concept proposals

Proposals from National Implementing Entities (NIEs)

Regular proposals:

United Republic of Tanzania (1): Bunda Climate Resilient and Adaptation Project (Project Concept; National Environment Management Council (NEMC); TZA/NIE/Agric/2019/1; US\$ 1,400,000)

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

- a) Endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Request the secretariat to notify NEMC of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issue:
 - (i) The calculations for the total project cost (and therefore associated fees) are not correct from the Project Component and Financing Table. The Agency is requested to adjust the Project and Financing Table accordingly;
- c) Approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 30,000;
- d) Request the NEMC to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania; and
- e) Encourage the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania to submit, through the NEMC, a fully-developed project proposal.

(Decision B.33/28)

United Republic of Tanzania (2): Enhancing Climate Change Adaptation for Agro-Pastoral Communities in Kongwa District (Project Concept; National Environment Management Council (NEMC); TZA/NIE/Agric/2019/2; US\$ 1,200,000)

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

- a) Endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Request the secretariat to notify NEMC of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision;
- c) Approve the project formulation grant of US \$30,000;

- d) Request the NEMC to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania; and
- e) Encourage the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania to submit, through the NEMC, a fully-developed project proposal.

(Decision B.33/29)

United Republic of Tanzania (3): Strategic Water Harvesting Technologies for Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change in Rural Communities in Semi-Arid Areas of Tanzania (SWAHAT) (Project Concept; National Environment Management Council (NEMC); TZA/NIE/Water/2019/1; US\$ 1,280,000)

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

- f) Endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) to the request made by the technical review;
- g) Request the secretariat to notify NEMC of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision;
- a)
- b) Approve the project formulation grants of US \$30,000;
- c) Request the NEMC to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania; and
- d) Encourage the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania to submit, through the NEMC, a fully-developed project proposal.

(Decision B.33/30)

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Regular proposals:

Afghanistan: Climate change resilient livelihoods advanced in Afghanistan (Project Concept; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); AFG/MIE/Water/2019/1; US\$ 9,432,556)

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

- a) 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) Request the secretariat to notify UNDP of 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 proposal should identify and describe activities to a point where risks related to the Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy (GP) can be effectively and comprehensively identified;
 - (ii) The fully-developed proposal should further demonstrate how the project design takes into account non-climatic barriers;
 - (iii) The fully-developed proposal should outline the particular benefits the project will provide to marginalized communities, if any, and should include evidence of consultation with such groups, along with a description of how the project document takes into account their interests and concerns, in line with the ESP;
 - (iv) The fully-developed proposal should identify all relevant potentially overlapping initiatives, outline linkages and synergies with the proposed project, draw lessons from earlier initiatives, and establish a framework for coordination during implementation;
 - (v) The fully-developed proposal shall include an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment in line with the ESP and GP of the Fund to evaluate the potential risks associated with the project's interventions, along with an Environmental and Social Management Plan, using the format of the Fund;
- c) Request the UNDP to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Afghanistan; and
- d) Encourage the Government of Afghanistan to submit, through the UNDP, a fully-developed project proposal.

(Decision B.33/31)

Republic of the Congo: Building Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in Vulnerable Communities Living in the Congo River Basin (Project Concept; World Food Programme (WFP); COG/MIE/Food/2019/1; US\$ 9,932,901)

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

- a) Endorse the project concept as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the World Food Programme (WFP) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Request the secretariat to notify WFP of 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 clarify whether and how the chosen approach and project activities were decided upon after examining alternatives during project formulation;

- (ii) The proposal should clarify whether and how the project is in line with the National Communications or other relevant national or sub-national development strategies and plans;
 - (iii) The full proposal should identify all relevant potentially overlapping initiatives, outline linkages and synergies with the proposed project;
 - (iv) The fully-developed proposal shall include an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment in line with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund to evaluate the potential risks associated with the project's interventions, along with an Environmental and Social Management Plan, using the format of the Fund;
- c) Request WFP to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of the Republic of Congo; and
 - d) Encourage the Government of the Republic of Congo to submit, through the WFP, a fully-developed project proposal.

(Decision B.33/32)

Malawi: Enhancing Adaptive Capacity and Livelihood Diversification for the Rural Poor of Northern Malawi (Project Concept; African Development Bank (AfDB); MWI/MIE/Rural/2019/1; US\$ 4,662,000)

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

- a) Endorse the project concept as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by African Development Bank (AfDB) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Request the secretariat to notify AfDB of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issue:
 - (i) The fully-developed proposal shall include an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment in line with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund to evaluate the potential risks associated with the project's interventions, along with an Environmental and Social Management Plan, using the format of the Fund;
- c) Request AfDB to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Malawi; and
- d) Encourage the Government of Malawi to submit, through AfDB, a fully-developed project proposal.

(Decision B.33/33)

Moldova: Talent-retention for Rural Transformation – Adapt (TART-Adapt) (Project Concept; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); MDA/MIE/Food/2019/1; US\$ 6,035,421)

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

- a) Endorse the project concept as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Request the secretariat to notify IFAD of 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 proposal should further demonstrate cost-effectiveness and sustainability;
 - (ii) The full proposal should identify all relevant potentially overlapping initiatives, outline linkages and synergies with the proposed project;
 - (iii) The fully-developed project proposal should include the environmental and social assessments, and gender assessments as annexes;
 - (iv) The fully-developed project proposal should include a detailed consultation that should take place taking into account the most vulnerable groups and considering Adaptation Fund environmental and gender policies;
 - (v) The fully-developed proposal shall include an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment in line with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund to evaluate the potential risks associated with the project's interventions, along with an Environmental and Social Management Plan, using the format of the Fund;
- c) Request IFAD to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Moldova; and
- d) Encourage the Government of Moldova to submit, through IFAD, a fully-developed project proposal.

(Decision B.33/34)

Pakistan: Enhance community and local and national-level government capacities to address climate change interrelated urban flood and drought risks and impacts (Project Concept; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); PAK/MIE/Urban/2018/1; US\$ 6,094,000)

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

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

- b) To request the secretariat to notify UN-Habitat of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board decision, as well as the following issues:
- (i) The fully-developed proposal should provide an exhaustive list of eligible concrete intervention measures stemming from community consultation and vulnerability assessments;
 - (ii) In the case of unidentified sub projects (USPs), the fully-developed project proposal should provide clear justification and an environmental and social management system (ESMS) for the USPs;
 - (iii) The fully-developed proposal shall include an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment in line with the Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy of the Fund to evaluate the potential risks associated with the project's interventions, along with an Environmental and Social Management Plan, using the format of the Fund, including a clear process of risks identification during project implementation;
 - (iv) The proposal should provide a description of the requirements for the project activities and how the project will comply with the national technical standards, in accordance with the Adaptation Fund's ESP, specifically in relation to Principle 13 (Public Health);
 - (v) The proposal should clearly outline the linkages and synergies with all relevant, potentially overlapping projects and programmes;
 - (vi) The proposal should provide evidence of a comprehensive, gender-responsive consultative process involving key stakeholders of the proposed project and should demonstrate that the outcomes of the consultative process were considered in the design of the proposed interventions;
- c) Request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Pakistan; and
- d) To encourage the Government of Pakistan to submit, through UN-Habitat, a fully-developed project proposal that would address the observations under subparagraph (b), above.

(Decision B.33/35)

Viet Nam: Enhancing the resilience inclusive and sustainable eco-human settlement development through small scale infrastructure interventions in the coastal regions of the Mekong Delta (Project Concept; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); VNM/MIE/Urban/2019/1; US\$ 5,754,840)

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

- a) Not endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;

- b) Request the secretariat to notify UN-Habitat of 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 address the issue of a lack of management capacity for water-related infrastructure, and the absence of an effective policy framework for Viet Nam, which might be detrimental to the sustainability, operationality and scale-up potential of the project;
 - (ii) The project concept should further explore the alternatives to the proposed technology;
 - (iii) The proposal should further inform on its cost-effectiveness and sustainability;
 - (iv) The proposal should report of previous initiatives and further clarify on potential synergies and complementarities with other initiatives in the target area; and
- c) Request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Viet Nam.

(Decision B.33/36)

Zimbabwe: Strengthening local communities' adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change through sustainable groundwater exploitation in Zimbabwe (Project Concept; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); ZWE/CIE/Water/2018/1; US\$ 4,817,400)

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

- a) Endorse the project concept, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Request the secretariat to notify UNESCO of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issue:
 - (i) The fully developed proposal should pay special attention to the national institutions that will participate in the project; the creation of a National Centre for Groundwater Research and Training; and the project's plans to strengthen the national institutions for managing groundwater, with considerations for cost-effectiveness and sustainability;
 - (ii) The fully-developed proposal shall include an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment in line with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund to evaluate the potential risks associated with the project's interventions, along with an Environmental and Social Management Plan, using the format of the Fund;
- c) Request UNESCO to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Zimbabwe; and

- d) Encourage the Government of Zimbabwe to submit through UNESCO, a fully-developed project proposal that would address the observations under subparagraph b), above.

(Decision B.33/37)

- c) *Review of regional project and programme proposals*

Fully-developed proposals

Proposals from Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs)

Argentina and Uruguay: Climate change adaptation in vulnerable coastal cities and ecosystems of the Uruguay River (Fully-developed Project Document; *Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina* (CAF; Development Bank of Latin America); LAC/RIE/DRR/2017/1; US\$ 13,999,996)

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

- a) Note the recommendation that the Adaptation Fund Board:
- (i) Approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Banco de Desarrollo de America Latina (CAF; Development Bank of Latin America) to the request made by the technical review;
 - (ii) Approve, subject to the availability of funds, the funding of US\$ 13,999,996 for the implementation of the project, as requested by CAF; and
 - (iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with CAF as the regional implementing entity for the project; and
- b) Note that the project had been placed on the project/programme waitlist pursuant to Decision B.33/45.

(Decision B.33/38)

Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger: Integration of Climate Change Adaptation Measures in the Concerted Management of the WAP Transboundary Complex: ADAPT-WAP (Fully-developed Project Document; Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); AFR/RIE/DRR/2016/1; US\$ 11,536,200)

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

- a) Note the recommendation that the Adaptation Fund Board:
- (i) Approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) to the request made by the technical review;
 - (ii) Approve, subject to the availability of funds, the funding of US\$ 11,536,200 for the implementation of the project, as requested by OSS; and

- (iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with OSS as the regional implementing entity for the project; and
- b) Note that the project had been placed on the project/programme waitlist pursuant to Decision B.33/45.

(Decision B.33/39)

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Albania, Montenegro and North Macedonia: Integrated climate-resilient transboundary flood risk management in the Drin River basin in the Western Balkans (Fully-developed Project Document; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); EE/MIE/DRR/2018/PPC/1; US\$ 9,927,750).

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

- a) Approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Approve the funding of US\$ 9,927,750 for the implementation of the project, as requested by UNDP; and
- c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UNDP as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

(Decision B.33/40)

Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Comoros: Building urban climate resilience in south-eastern Africa (Fully-developed Project Document; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); AFR/MIE/DRR/2016/1; US\$ 13,997,423)

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

- a) Note the recommendation that the Adaptation Fund Board:
 - (i) Approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;
 - (ii) Approve, subject to the availability of funds, the funding of US\$ 13,997,423 for the implementation of the project, as requested by UN-Habitat; and
 - (iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UN-Habitat as the multilateral implementing entity for the project. The agreement should include a commitment from UN-Habitat that, prior to first disbursement, UN-Habitat will submit an the fully developed project document, which is updated to include:

- a. Adequate provisions for utilising the specific expertise that is already present in each of the participating countries and a corresponding item of the budget;
 - b. Specific monitoring and annual reporting on the management arrangements for involuntary resettlement as well as on the information provided to affected parties on the grievance mechanism; and
 - c. A plan that a detailed intervention location-specific gender assessment will be carried out during project inception and that the findings thereof will be used as baseline for project monitoring both for Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy purposes.
- b) Note that the project had been placed on the project/programme waitlist pursuant to Decision B.33/45.

(Decision B.33/41)

Thailand, Viet Nam: Mekong EbA south: Enhancing climate resilience in the Greater Mekong sub-region through Ecosystem based Adaptation in the context of south-south cooperation (Fully-developed Project Document; United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment); ASI/MIE/WATER/2016/1; US\$ 7,000,000)

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

- a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Suggest that UN Environment 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 how the two countries' "drivenness" will be ensured for activities that involve other countries;
 - (ii) The proponent should list all the relevant national technical standards, and explain how the project interventions meet them;
 - (iii) The proposal should explain the arrangements through which the project will sustain the project benefits (financially, socially and technically) over time;
 - (iv) The proposal should bring the risk identification section in line with the Environmental and Social Policy requirements and Gender Policy, in light of project interventions described in supplement documents I and II, and should provide an Environmental and Social Management Plan commensurate to such risks; and
- c) Request UN Environment to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Governments of Thailand and Viet Nam.

(Decision B.33/42)**Concept proposals***Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)*

Jordan, Lebanon: Increasing the Resilience of Displaced Persons to Climate Change-related Water Challenges in Urban Host Settlements (Project Concept; United Nations Human Settlements Program (UN-Habitat); ASI/MIE/Urban/2018/PPC/1; US\$ 14,000,000)

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

- a) Endorse the project concept as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Program (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Request the secretariat to notify UN-Habitat of 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 proposal should provide more detailed information on projected future climate impacts for the region;
 - (ii) The fully-developed project proposal should provide more information on the municipal plans, how they will effectively contribute to building resilience and what particular measures it may contain to support adaptation;
 - (iii) The fully-developed project proposal should further clarify financial sustainability after the project has ended and undertake a detailed risk and impact screening as well as gender related assessments in line with the Adaptation Fund's policies;
- c) Approve the project formulation grant of US\$ 80,000;
- d) Request to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Governments of Jordan and Lebanon; and
- e) Encourage the Governments of Jordan and Lebanon to submit, through UN-Habitat, a fully-developed proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph b), above.

(Decision B.33/43)

Pre-concept proposals

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Belize, Guatemala and Honduras: Increasing climate resilience through restoration of degraded landscapes in the Atlantic region of Central America (Project Pre-concept; United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment); LAC/MIE/DRR/2018/PPC/1; US\$ 12,260,500)

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

- a) Endorse the project pre-concept, as supplemented by the clarification response provided by UN Environment to the request made by the technical review;
- b) Request the secretariat to transmit to UN Environment the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following recommendations:
 - (i) The concept document should elaborate on and strengthen the rationale for the regional approach, including following the consultation process during concept development;
 - (ii) At the concept stage, the role of national ministries and institutions, as relevant, in the execution of the project should be further described and their designation, as relevant, as executing entities for this project should be formalized in the document;
 - (iii) The concept document should clarify the budget structure of the execution costs, taking into account the different layers of international, regional, national and eventually local organizations that will be involved in the execution of the project;
 - (iv) The concept document should clarify the role of UN Environment in the development process of the project;
- c) Request UN Environment to transmit the observations referred to in sub-paragraph b) to the Governments of Belize, Guatemala and Honduras; and
- d) Encourage the Governments of Belize, Guatemala and Honduras to submit, through UN Environment, a project concept proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph b), above.

(Decision B.33/44)

Prioritization of Projects on the Waitlist

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

- a) Note the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee to approve the following projects/programmes;

- (i) Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger (AFB/PPRC.24/34);
 - (ii) Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Comoros (AFB/PPRC.24/37);
 - (iii) Argentina, Uruguay (AFB/PPRC.24/33);
- b) Establish the waitlist for fully-developed regional project/programmes according to subparagraph (b) (ii) of Decision B.28/1;
 - c) Place on the waitlist the project/programmes listed in subparagraph a) above according to the prioritization criteria established in Decision B.17/19 and clarified in Decision B.19/5; and
 - d) Consider the projects/programmes on the waitlist for intersessional or Board meeting approval in the order of rank in which they are listed in subparagraph a) above, and subject to the availability of funds.

(Decision B.33/45)

Agenda Item 9: Report of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC)

81. Ms. Sheida Asgharzadeh Ghahroudi (Islamic Republic of Iran, Asia Pacific), Chair of the EFC, and Mr. Mattias Broman (Sweden, Annex I Parties), Vice-Chair of the EFC presented the report of the EFC (AFB/EFC.24/9).

82. Following the report, the Board discussed a range of issues. In response to a question on the budget for the evaluation function of the secretariat, it was clarified that one full-time staff member was envisioned, supplemented by an administrative assistant or possible short-term consultant. In addition, in line with terms of reference of the AF-TERG contained in Annex III to the report of the thirty-first meeting of the Board (AFB/B.31/ 8), the AF-TERG would consist of a Chair and four members. On the issue of delays in project inception, it was proposed that the work be expanded to a more global scale and examine the reasons that had led to delays in project implementation. On the reorganization of an implementing entity, it was noted that: the proposed approach seemed passive and that IEs should be obligated to notify the Board when changes were made; it is necessary to be more proactive in reminding them of their existing obligations and ensuring any necessary new obligations were in place. The secretariat recalled the original scope of the document and noted the goal was to provide predictability on what would need to be done when changes happened.

83. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), the Board subsequently took the following decisions on the matters considered by the EFC at its twenty-fourth meeting.

a) Review of the Strategic Results Framework and the Fund Level Effectiveness and Efficiency Results Framework

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

- a) To approve the Review of the Strategic Results Framework and the Adaptation Fund Level Effectiveness and Efficiency Results Framework as contained in document AFB/EFC.24/4/Rev.1; and
- b) To request the secretariat to prepare a document on a proposed revision of the results tracker and an updated document on guidance on the revised results tracker, to be presented to the Ethics and Finance Committee at its twenty-sixth meeting.

(Decision B.33/46)

b) Delays in project inception

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

- a) To conduct an analysis of whether implementing entities identified risks associated with possible project inception delays and how the implementing entities have mitigated identified risks and unidentified risks;
- b) To expand the analysis contained in document AFB/EFC.24/5 by seeking further information on other climate funds' policies on addressing project inception delays and their implementation of such policies; and
- c) To prepare a document which contains the information related to subparagraphs (a) and (b) as well as recommendations on a possible course of action to the Ethics and Finance Committee at its twenty-fifth meeting.

(Decision B.33/47)

c) Implications of the reorganization of an implementing entity

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

- a) To approve the process to address implications of the implementing entity's reorganization in terms of project implementation and the process to address implications on accreditation and/or re-accreditation process, as described in document AFB/EFC.24/3/Rev.1;
- b) To request the secretariat to communicate this decision and document AFB/EFC.24/3/Rev.1 to the implementing entities; and
- c) To request the implementing entities to communicate any reorganization to the secretariat as early as possible.

(Decision B.33/48)

d) Financial issues

87. The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided to approve the draft secretariat work schedule and proposed work plan for FY20, as contained in document AFB/EFC.24/7.

(Decision B.33/49)

88. The Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:
- a) To approve, from the resources available in the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund:
 - (i) The proposed budget of US\$ 5,247,437 to cover the costs of the operations of the Board and secretariat over the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, comprising US\$ 4,054,723 for the secretariat administrative services (the main secretariat budget), US\$ 537,900 for the accreditation services and US\$ 654,814 for the Readiness Programme;
 - (ii) The proposed budget of US\$ 793,843 to cover the costs of the operations of the evaluation function of the Adaptation Fund over the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020, comprising US\$ 493,843 for the general operations and US\$ 300,000 for evaluations; and
 - (iii) The proposed budget of US\$ 682,150 for the trustee services to be provided to the Adaptation Fund over the period 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020; and
 - b) To authorize the trustee to transfer the amounts in subparagraph a) (i) and (ii) to the secretariat, and the amount in subparagraph a) (iii) to the trustee.

(Decision B.33/50)**Agenda Item 10: Implementation of the Medium-term Strategy**

89. The representative of the secretariat introduced the agenda item and said that due to the lack of time to discuss the matter it was proposed to have the secretariat resubmit documents AFB/B.33/5 and AFB/B.33/6 for the consideration of the Board intersessionally. In response to a query on how the proposals differed from the earlier recommendation of the PPRC, which had not been adopted, the manager of the secretariat explained that the issues were different. The documents being considered under the present agenda item were technical documents that presented a series of templates that had been requested by the Board at its thirty-second meeting and did not require the extensive discussion that the Board had considered necessary for the earlier recommendation.

Decision related to Agenda Item 10 Implementation of the Medium-term Strategy: a) Arrangements for learning grants; b) Arrangements for project scale-up grants

90. Recalling decisions B.32/38 and B.32/39, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided to request the secretariat to submit, intersessionally between the thirty-third and thirty-fourth meetings of the Board, document AFB/B.33/5 and document AFB/B.33/6 to the Board for consideration and decision.

(Decision B.33/51)**Agenda Item 11: Procedural steps for receiving contributions from alternative sources**

91. Owing to a lack of time, the Board did not take up the agenda item.

Agenda Item 12: Provision of financial resources between single-country and regional concrete adaptation project and programmes (country cap)

92. Owing to a lack of time, the Board did not take up the agenda item.

Agenda Item 13: Issues remaining from the thirty-second meeting:

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

93. Owing to a lack of time, the Board did not take up the agenda item.

b) *Late-stage withdrawals of proposals by multilateral implementing entities;*

94. Owing to a lack of time, the Board did not take up the agenda item.

c) *Report of the portfolio monitoring mission to Cambodia;*

95. Owing to a lack of time, the Board did not take up the agenda item.

d) *Report of the portfolio monitoring mission to South Africa;*

96. Owing to a lack of time, the Board did not take up the agenda item.

Agenda Item 14: Report of the portfolio monitoring mission to Rwanda

97. Owing to a lack of time, the Board did not take up the agenda item.

Agenda Item 15: Issues arising from fourteenth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 14), and the third part of the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 1-3).

98. The secretariat presented the decisions of CMP 14 and CMA 1 related to the Adaptation Fund (document AFB/B.33/11) and possible matters to be considered by the Board in line with these decisions. The decisions finalized the process for the Fund to serve the Paris Agreement and to operate under the guidance of the CMA. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) at its fiftieth session (June 2019) would consider the matter related to eligibility for membership on the Adaptation Fund Board and would forward a recommendation to CMP 15 in November 2019. In addition, the CMP requested the Board to make recommendations to CMP 15, which will be forwarded to CMA 2 in November 2019, on: (i) the rules of procedure of the Board; (ii) the arrangements of the Fund with respect to the Paris Agreement; (iii) any other matter so as to ensure the Fund serves the Paris Agreement smoothly; and (iv) implications of the Fund receiving the share of proceeds from activities under Articles 6, 12 and 17 of the Kyoto Protocol when the Fund serves the Paris Agreement.

99. The Board discussion highlighted the complex nature of the issue: what needed to be done now in light of the Paris Agreement; whether developing countries that had ratified the Paris Agreement were the only eligible participants; whether the composition of the Board needed to change; and, what happened to countries that were Parties to the Kyoto Protocol but not yet

Parties to the Paris Agreement. The Board also considered possible approaches for fulfilling the request from the CMP and ensuring that the report was ready for consideration by the Board's October meeting. It discussed creating a task force that could develop a structure of the key issues for the Board to address, as well as the task force's terms of reference, its composition and the agenda for its work. It was noted the Board should separate the political issues from the issues within the request from the CMP decision. Notably, one of the four tasks mandated by the CMP needed special attention on the timeline because the memorandum of understanding with the GEF and the terms and conditions with the interim trustee expire 30 May 2020. The discussion also focused on the costs of holding an additional two-day meeting in conjunction with the SBI versus convening an additional regular meeting.

100. Having considered document AFB/B.33/11, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- a) To request the secretariat to prepare for inclusion of, in the draft addendum to the report of the Board to the Conference of the Parties serving as meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol at its fifteenth session (CMP 15), possible Board's consideration and recommendations on the tasks mandated by decision 1/CMP.14 "Matters Relating to the Adaptation Fund," and submit them to the Board for consideration at its meeting in October 2019;
- b) To request the secretariat, in preparation of the Board's consideration and recommendations mentioned in subparagraph a), to consult with the UNFCCC Secretariat, the interim trustee (the World Bank) and the GEF Secretariat on relevant matters;
- c) To establish a task force to provide guidance to the secretariat on:
 - (i) defining the scope of the elements to be included in the Board's consideration and recommendations on the tasks mandated by decision 1/CMP.14;
 - (ii) seeking inputs on the matter referred to in subparagraph a) from the trustee, the GEF, the UNFCCC Secretariat and other relevant sources;
 - (iii) reflecting the inputs referred to in subparagraph c)(ii) in possible Board's consideration and recommendations referred to in subparagraph a); and
 - (iv) considering any other matters that may arise related to subparagraphs a), b) and c);
- d) To elect the following as members of the tasks force which will serve until the Board meeting in October 2019 to fulfil the tasks as described in subparagraph c):
 - (i) Ms. Sylviane Bilgischer (Chair of the Board, Belgium, Annex I Parties);
 - (ii) Mr. Ibila Djibril (Vice-Chair of the Board, Benin, Africa);
 - (iii) Ms. Claudia Keller (Germany, Western European and Others Group);
 - (iv) Ms. Elenora Cogo (Italy, Western European and Others Group);
 - (v) Ms. Sheida Asgharzadeh Ghahroudi (Islamic Republic of Iran, Asia-Pacific);

- (vi) Mr. Philip Weech (Bahamas, Latin American and the Caribbean);
- (vii) Mr. Mohammed Zmerli (Tunisia, Africa);
- (viii) Mr. Aram Ter-Zakaryan (Armenia, Eastern Europe);
- e) To hold an additional meeting of the Board in Bonn, Germany, on 28-29 June 2019, in addition to the Board meeting scheduled in October 2019, to discuss the matter related to a); and
- f) To request the task force and the secretariat to report the progress of the work contained in subparagraphs a), b) and c) to the Board at its meeting on 28-29 June 2019.

(Decision B.33/52)

Agenda Item 16: Knowledge management, communications and outreach

101. Owing to a lack of time, the Board did not take up the agenda item.

Agenda Item 17: Financial issues:

a) Financial status of the Trust Fund and CER monetization

102. Owing to a lack of time, the Board did not take up the agenda item. Information on this matter can be found in the report of the Ethics and Finance Committee in document (AFB/EFC.24/9).

Agenda Item 18: Dialogue with civil society organizations

103. The report of the dialogue with civil society organizations is contained in Annex V of the present report.

Agenda Item 19: Date and venue of meetings in 2019 and onward

104. The manager of the secretariat reminded the Board that it had decided, pursuant to Decision B.33/52, to hold an additional meeting in Bonn, Germany, on 28-29 June 2019.

105. The Adaptation Fund Board decided:

- a) To hold its thirty-fourth meeting in Bonn, Germany from 7-11 October 2019;
- b) To hold its thirty-fifth meeting in Bonn, Germany from 17-20 March 2020; and
- c) To hold its thirty-sixth meeting in Bonn, Germany from 13-16 October 2020.

(Decision B.33/53)

Agenda item 20: Code of Conduct

106. The Chair drew the attention of the code of conduct and asked the Members and Alternates whether they wished to raise any issues related to the implementation of the code of conduct. No issues were raised.

Agenda item 21: Other matters*a) Decision related to civil society participation and engagement*

107. It was generally agreed that it would be important to enhance the participation of civil society in the work of the Board but it was also asked how large that participation should be and how the representatives of civil society would be chosen; civil society was larger than those representatives of the non-governmental organizations attending the present meeting.

108. The manager of the secretariat explained that it was intended to make an open call to the civil society which would allow anyone interested to respond with suggestions on how to enhance the participation and engagement by civil society in the work of the Board.

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

- a) To explore, in consultation with civil society and drawing lessons from other climate funds, options to further enhance civil society participation and engagement in the work of the Board; and
- b) To prepare a document and submit it to the Board for consideration at the thirty-fourth meeting.

(Decision B.33/54)

b) Decision related to a quorum

110. In response to query about how the rules on quorum affected the work of the Board's committees, the manager of the secretariat explained that the Board's rules of procedure applied to its committees as well.

111. Considering the quorum defined in the paragraph 23 of the Rules of Procedure of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), the Board decided to request the secretariat to explore options to address the issue of an absence of a quorum, including other climate funds' relevant practices, and present a document which contains an analysis of the explored options to the Board for consideration at its thirty-fourth meeting.

(Decision B.33/55)

Agenda item 22: Adoption of the report

112. The present report was adopted intersessionally by the Board following its thirty-third meeting.

Agenda item 23: closure of the meeting

113. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 6:45 p.m. on 15 March 2019.

ANNEX I

ATTENDANCE AT THE THIRTY-THIRD 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. Victor Viñas	Dominican Republic	Latin America and the Caribbean
Mr. Nilesh Prakash	Fiji	Small Island Developing States
Mr. Chebet Maikut	Uganda	Least Developed Countries
Ms. Claudia Keller	Germany	Western European and Others Group
Ms. Eleonora Cogo	Italy	Western European and Others Group
Ms. Sylviane Bilgischer	Belgium	Annex I Parties
Mr. Mattias Broman	Sweden	Annex I Parties
Mr. Charles Mutai	Kenya	Non-Annex I Parties

ALTERNATES		
Name	Country	Constituency
Mr. Mohamed Zmerli	Tunisia	Africa
Ms. Sheida Asgharzadeh Ghahroudi	Islamic Republic of Iran	Asia-Pacific
Mr. Ahmed Waheed	Maldives	Asia-Pacific
Ms. Yadira González Columbié	Cuba	Latin America and the Caribbean
Mr. Philip Weech	Bahamas	Latin America and the Caribbean
Mr. Paul Elreen Phillip	Grenada	Small Island Developing States
Ms. Susan Castro-Acuña Baixauli	Spain	Western European and Others Group
Mr. Marc-Antoine Martin	France	Annex I Parties
Mr. Patrick Sieber	Switzerland	Annex I Parties
Mr. Evans Njewa	Malawi	Non-Annex I Parties

ANNEX II**ADOPTED AGENDA OF THE THIRTY-THIRD MEETING OF THE ADAPTATION FUND BOARD**

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Election of outstanding officers.
3. Transition of the Chair and the Vice-Chair.
4. Organizational matters:
 - a) Adoption of the agenda;
 - b) Organization of work.
5. Report on activities of the Chair.
6. Report on activities of the secretariat.
7. Report of the Accreditation Panel.
8. Report of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) on:
 - a) Full cost of adaptation reasoning criterion;
 - b) Funding for Enhanced Direct Access;
 - c) Amendments to the project review process;
 - d) Guidance to the MIE Aggregators for the preparation of the proposals on supporting the innovation small grants non-NIE window;
 - e) Report of the secretariat on the intersessional review of cycle of readiness grants;
 - f) Report of the secretariat on initial screening/technical review of projects and programmes;
 - g) Report of the secretariat on initial screening/technical review of small innovation grant project proposals;
 - h) Report of the secretariat on initial screening/technical review of learning grant proposals;
 - i) Report of the secretariat on initial screening/technical review of scale-up grant proposals.
9. Report of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) on:

- a) Review of the Strategic Results Framework and Fund-Level Effectiveness and Efficiency Results Framework;
 - b) Delays in project implementation;
 - c) Implications of the reorganization of an implementing entity;
 - d) Financial issues.
10. Implementation of the Medium-term Strategy:
- a) Arrangements for learning grants;
 - b) Arrangements for project scale-up grants.
11. Procedural steps for receiving contributions from alternative sources.
12. Provision of financial resources between single-country and regional concrete adaptation projects and programmes (country cap).
13. Issues remaining from the thirty-second meeting:
- a) Strategic discussion on objectives and further steps of the Fund. Potential linkages between the Fund and the Green Climate Fund;
 - b) Late-stage withdrawals of proposals by multilateral implementing entities;
 - c) Report of the portfolio monitoring mission to Cambodia;
 - d) Report of the portfolio monitoring mission to South Africa.
14. Reports of the portfolio monitoring mission to Rwanda.
15. Issues arising from fourteenth session of the Conference of the Parties serving as meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP 14), and the third part of the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement (CMA 1-3).
16. Knowledge management, communications and outreach.
17. Financial issues:
- (a) Financial status of the trust fund and CER monetization.
18. Dialogue with civil society organizations.
19. Date and venue of meetings in 2019 and onwards.
20. Implementation of the code of conduct.
21. Other matters.

22. Adoption of the report.
23. Closure of the meeting.

ANNEX III

PROJECT-RELATED FUNDING DECISIONS

1. Full Proposals: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
NIE									
	Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.24/8	835,465	835,465			Not approve	0
	Armenia	EPIU	AFB/PPRC.24/9	2,506,000	2,506,000			Approve	2,506,000
	Dominican Republic	IDDI	AFB/PPRC.24/10	9,953,692	9,953,692			Approve	9,953,692
	Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.24/11	4,127,065	4,127,065			Not approve	0
RIE									
	Saint Lucia	CDB	AFB/PPRC.24/12	9,858,570		9,858,570		Not approve	0
MIE									
	Bangladesh	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.24/13	9,995,369			9,995,369	Approve	9,995,369
	Cambodia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.24/14	5,000,000			5,000,000	Not approve	0
	Georgia	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.24/15	4,644,794			4,644,794	Not approve	0
	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.24/16	9,865,651			9,865,651	Not approve	0
	Lao PDR	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.24/17	5,500,000			5,500,000	Not approve	0
	Lesotho	WFP	AFB/PPRC.24/18	9,999,891			9,999,891	Not approve	0
	Sierra Leone	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.24/19	9,916,925			9,916,925	Not approve	0
	Tajikistan	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.24/20	9,996,441			9,996,441	Not approve	0
	Turkmenistan	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.24/21	7,000,040			7,000,040	Not approve	0
	Uganda	AfDB	AFB/PPRC.24/22	2,249,000			2,249,000	Not approve	0
Sub-total, USD				101,448,903	17,422,222	9,858,570	74,168,111		22,455,061
2. Concepts: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
NIE									
	United Republic of Tanzania (1)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC.24/23	1,400,000	1,400,000			Endorse	-
	United Republic of Tanzania (2)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC.24/24	1,200,000	1,200,000			Endorse	-
	United Republic of Tanzania (3)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC.24/25	1,280,000	1,280,000			Endorse	-
MIE									
	Afghanistan	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.24/26	9,432,556			9,432,556	Endorse	-
	Congo (Republic of)	WFP	AFB/PPRC.24/27	9,932,901			9,932,901	Endorse	-
	Malawi	AfDB	AFB/PPRC.24/28	4,662,000			4,662,000	Endorse	-
	Moldova	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.24/29	6,035,421			6,035,421	Endorse	-
	Pakistan	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.24/30	6,094,000			6,094,000	Endorse	-
	Viet Nam	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.24/31	5,754,840			5,754,840	Not endorse	-
	Zimbabwe	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.24/32	4,817,400			4,817,400	Endorse	-
Sub-total, USD				50,609,118	3,880,000		46,729,118		
3. Project Formulation Grants: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
NIE									
	United Republic of Tanzania (1)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC.24/23/ Add.1	30,000	30,000			Approve	30,000
	United Republic of Tanzania (2)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC.24/24/ Add.1	30,000	30,000			Approve	30,000
	United Republic of Tanzania (3)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC.24/25/ Add.1	30,000	30,000			Approve	30,000
Sub-total, USD				90,000	90,000				90,000

4. Full Proposals: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
RIE									
	Argentina, Uruguay	CAF	AFB/PPRC.24/33	13,999,996		13,999,996		Waitlist (3)	0
	Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger	OSS	AFB/PPRC.24/34	11,536,200		11,536,200		Waitlist (1)	0
MIE									
	Albania, North Macedonia, Montenegro	UNDP	AFB/PPRC.24/35	9,927,750			9,927,750	Approve	9,927,750
	Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Comoros	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.24/37	13,997,423			13,997,423	Waitlist (2)	0
	Thailand, Viet Nam	UN Environment	AFB/PPRC.24/38	7,000,000			7,000,000	Not approve	0
	Sub-total, USD			56,461,369		25,536,196	30,925,173		9,927,750
5. Concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
MIE									
	Jordan, Lebanon	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.24/39	14,000,000			14,000,000	Endorse	-
	Sub-total, USD			14,000,000			14,000,000		
6. Project Formulation Grants: Regional Concepts	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
MIE									
	Jordan, Lebanon	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.24/39/ Add.1	80,000			80,000	Approve	80,000
	Sub-total, USD			80,000			80,000		80,000
7. Pre-concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
MIE									
	Belize, Guatemala, Honduras	UN Environment	AFB/PPRC.24/40	12,260,500			12,260,500	Endorse	-
	Sub-total, USD			12,260,500			12,260,500		
GRAND TOTAL (1+2+3+4+5+6+7)				234,949,890	21,392,222	35,394,766	178,162,902		32,552,811

ANNEX IV

APPROVED FY19 AND FY20 BUDGETS OF THE BOARD AND SECRETARIAT, THE EVALUATION FUNCTION, AND THE TRUSTEE

All amounts in US\$	Approved FY19	Estimate FY19	Approved FY20
BOARD AND SECRETARIAT			
1 Personnel	2,924,519	2,789,984	2,996,361
2 Travel	422,000	408,244	415,500
3 General operations	333,284	340,992	413,500
4 Meetings	250,800	240,000	229,362
Sub-total secretariat administrative services [a]	3,930,603	3,779,220	4,054,723
6 Accreditation [b]	546,040	493,501	537,900
7 Readiness Programme [c]	624,550	512,250	654,814
Total secretariat [a] + [b] + [c]	5,101,193	4,784,971	5,247,437
EVALUATION FUNCTION			
1 Personnel	301,272	80,000	376,843
2 Travel	76,000	35,000	81,000
3 General operations	-	7,500	31,000
4 Meetings	5,000	2,500	5,000
Sub-total evaluation function	382,272	125,000	493,843
5 Evaluation	-	-	300,000
Total evaluation function	382,272	125,000	793,843
TRUSTEE			
1 CER Monetization	180,000	180,000	180,000
2 Financial and Program Management	225,000	198,000	225,000
3 Investment Management	131,250	156,158	192,150
4 Accounting and Reporting	30,000	30,000	40,000
5 Legal Services	20,000	20,000	45,000
6 External Audit	-	-	-
Sub-total trustee	586,250	584,158	682,150
GRAND TOTAL ALL COMPONENTS	6,069,715	5,494,129	6,423,430

ANNEX V

REPORT OF THE DIALOGUE WITH CIVIL SOCIETY, 14 MARCH 2019, BONN, GERMANY

1. The Vice-Chair of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), Mr. Ibila Djibril (Benin, Africa), invited the Board to enter into a dialogue with civil society organizations (CSOs).
2. Patricia Velasco, FFLA, reported on the project in Ecuador, "Enhancing resilience of communities to the adverse effects of climate change on food security, in Pichincha Province and the Jubones River basin", which was being implemented by the World Food Programme (WFP), and was expected to benefit 15,000 families. A visit to the project had: observed the adaptation measures being implemented, conducted interviews with the beneficiaries and seen the improved quality of life and strong community ownership of the project. Land had been donated or sold for the water reservoirs, and in the Jubones basin a drinking water system had improved the life and health of the population, with neighboring communities replicating the same measures with their own resources.
3. It had taken some time to implement the project which had caused the communities to question the project, and their participation in it had decreased. The inception delays had been caused by both bureaucratic and organizational difficulties related to the requirements of the Fund. However, the "co-benefits" of the project had included community strengthening; the work had been done in "mingas", or collective labour for collective welfare, for the construction and maintenance of irrigation systems and drinking water systems.
4. The adaptation measures implemented had benefited the most vulnerable communities, and there had been strong support by those local communities which had participated in the project's implementation. Local governments had also had an agent at all project sites which facilitated the incorporation into local planning of the results of the vulnerability analysis and adaptation plan. However, the communities often prioritized measures according to their own immediate needs, which were sometimes also development needs. The communities also had high expectations that there would be a second phase to the project.
5. In Ecuador, international cooperation funds needed to be processed by the Ministry of Finance as the Ministry of Environment had no technical or operational capacity to receive such funds. She said that national accreditation was both tedious and difficult for public institutions, and suggested that the Board raise the Fund's country cap to keep the Fund attractive for Ecuador and create incentives for direct access.
6. In response to questions, she explained that the initiative had come from the communities in the Jubones river basin and said that it was important to have funding for the long-term sustainability of the project. In response to a query about why some of the measures being implemented were different from those originally identified, she said that that one reason might be the long delay between the approval of the project and its implementation.
7. Mawusé Hountondji, JVE-Benin, reported on the work of his organisation and Le Fond National pour l'Environnement et le Climat (FNEC) of Benin, whose accreditation as an NIE had lapsed in 2017. Some of the challenges FNEC had faced in preparing a fully-developed proposal had been a lack of reliable data, a lack of qualified staff, and misunderstandings between FNEC and the various stakeholders. With respect to its reaccreditation, he was of the view that FNEC had now met international standards and that essential governance documents were available, also a gender policy was in place. Consequently, JVE-Benin was recommending FNEC's re-

accreditation. A pipeline of projects had already been developed and FNEC had been accredited with the Green Climate Fund. FNEC had engaged with civil society in Benin, and had funded projects from its own funds. It was open to information sharing and relied on the on-the-ground experience and technical assistance of civil society. However, there had been limited collaboration with the MIE implementing the regional project in Benin, and there were challenges regarding stakeholder consultations and country ownership for regional projects generally. The board needed to ensure that RIEs and MIEs closely collaborated with a country's NIE on regional projects, and to ensure synergies between national and regional projects.

8. Julia Grimm, Germanwatch, described the Adaptation Fund NGO Network (Network) and its objectives. Its national and regional activities were the independent assessment of the Fund's projects, and awareness raising and capacity-building among local CSOs, in order to engage in Fund related processes and with stakeholders, in their country or region. She said that for meaningful and effective civil society engagement, documents had to be available at least 14 days before the Committee and Board meetings; civil society needed to both review the documents and agree on a common position. The present meeting should take a decision to post the documents on the Fund's webpage at least 14 days before the meetings. She also said that the Medium-Term Strategy 2018-2022 had aimed for the Board to work with the Network to explore greater collaboration during the 2018-2022 period and urged the Board to revise the Fund's procedures to achieve that. The present meeting should request the secretariat to call for proposals to enhance the effectiveness of civil society participation during Board meetings.

9. She also said that it was troubling that 73 per cent of the regional funding requests were from MIEs. To promote direct access, the distinctive feature of the Fund, she recommended that the Board decide to impose the 50 per cent MIE cap not only on MIEs but on RIE proposals as well. It should also apply it to regional proposals. Many regional project proposals often lacked: country ownership, coordination between the NIEs and the RIEs or MIEs, endorsement letters from Designated Authorities (DAs), and effective stakeholder consultation. Little synergy existed between regional projects and existing national initiatives, and regional projects did not always strengthen national institutional capacities. The regional projects that emerged should be based on the clear need for countries to regionally cooperate on the challenges presented by climate change. For example, the regional project proposal for Southern Africa, submitted by UNESCO, had to be revised to include a proper consultation process with national stakeholders.

10. In response to questions Mr. Hountondji said that 14 days was the minimum that was required for adequate consultations and reiterated that the MIEs needed to adequately work with NIEs and DAs to ensure that projects were really country owned.

11. Ms. Grimm said that although projects were endorsed by the DAs, that person was only a government official; the process needed to be institutionalized as governments changed. She also asked for more information on how the comments made by civil society were used and said that the added value of those comments related to the information they provided on the countries that was not readily available in the proposals. She also explained that the Network was principally funded by the German Government but also received funding at the local level.

12. The manager of the secretariat assured the Board that steps had already been undertaken to increase collaboration with civil society and that the comments received on the proposals had been carefully read and incorporated into the material reviewed by the PPRC. The briefing notes provided by the Network were also carefully reviewed by the secretariat.

13. The Vice-Chair thanked the civil society for their presentations and their participation.