RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROJECT AND PROGRAMME REVIEW COMMITTEE
ON PROPOSALS CONSIDERED DURING THE INTERSESSIONAL REVIEW CYCLE
Background

1. At its twenty-third meeting, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) discussed a recommendation made by the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) of the Board, on arranging intersessional review of project and programme proposals. Having considered the comments and recommendation of the PPRC, the Board decided to:

   (a) Arrange one intersessional project/programme review cycle annually, during an intersessional period of 24 weeks or more between two consecutive Board meetings, as outlined in document AFB/PPRC.14/13;

   (b) While recognizing that any proposal can be submitted to regular meetings of the Board, require that all first submissions of concepts and fully-developed project/programme documents continue to be considered in regular meetings of the PPRC;

   (c) Request the secretariat to review, during such intersessional review cycles, resubmissions of project/programme concepts and fully-developed project/programme documents submitted on time by proponents for consideration during such intersessional review cycles;

   (d) Request the PPRC to consider intersessionally the technical review of such proposals as prepared by the secretariat and to make intersessional recommendations to the Board;

   (e) Consider such intersessionally reviewed proposals for intersessional approval in accordance with the Rules of Procedure;

   (f) Inform implementing entities and other stakeholders about the new arrangement by sending a letter to this effect, and make the calendar of upcoming regular and intersessional review cycles available on the Adaptation Fund website and arrange the first such cycle between the twenty-third and twenty-fourth meetings of the Board;

   (g) Request the PPRC to defer to the next Board meeting any matters related to the competencies of the Ethics and Finance Committee that may come up during the intersessional review of projects/programmes and to refrain from making a recommendation on such proposals until the relevant matters are addressed; and

   (h) Request the secretariat to present, in the fifteenth meeting of the PPRC, and annually following each intersessional review cycle, an analysis of the intersessional review cycle.

   (Decision B.23/15)

2. At the twenty-fifth Board meeting, the secretariat had requested the Board to consider whether the rules in the intersessional project review cycle could be made more accommodating, with a view to speeding up the process. The Board subsequently decided to:

   (a) Amend Decision B.23/15 and require that all first submissions of concepts under the two-step approval process and all first submissions of fully-developed project/programme documents under the one-step process continue to be considered in regular meetings of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC);
(b) Request the secretariat to review, during its inter-sessional review cycles:

(i) First submissions of fully-developed project/programme documents for which the concepts had already been considered in regular meetings of the PPRC and subsequently endorsed by the Board;

(ii) Resubmissions of project/programme concepts and resubmissions of fully-developed project/programme documents;

(c) Request the PPRC to consider intersessionally the technical review of such proposals as prepared by the secretariat and to make intersessional recommendations to the Board;

(d) Consider such intersessionally reviewed proposals for intersessional approval in accordance with the Rules of Procedure; and

(e) Inform implementing entities and other stakeholders about the updated arrangement by sending a letter to this effect, and make effective such amendment as of the first day of the review cycle between the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth meetings of the Board.

(Decision B.25/2)
Project/programme proposals submitted by implementing entities

3. The PPRC considered, during the intersessional review cycle between the thirty-third and thirty-fourth meetings of the Board, nine single-country project proposals, three regional project proposals and one project formulation grant request, as well as the report of the secretariat on the initial screening and technical review, contained in the following documents (Table 1):

Table 1: Report of the secretariat and project proposals submitted to the intersessional review cycle between the thirty-first and thirty-second Adaptation Fund Board meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPRC Document Number</th>
<th>Document Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/1</td>
<td>Report of the Secretariat on Initial Screening/Technical Review of Project and Programme Proposals and AFB/PPRC.22-25/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/2</td>
<td>Proposal for Indonesia (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/3</td>
<td>Proposal for Indonesia (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/4</td>
<td>Proposal for Saint Lucia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/5</td>
<td>Proposal for Iran (Islamic Republic of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/6</td>
<td>Proposal for Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/7</td>
<td>Proposal for Lesotho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/8</td>
<td>Proposal for Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/9</td>
<td>Proposal for Tajikistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/10</td>
<td>Proposal for Turkmenistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/11</td>
<td>Proposal for Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/12</td>
<td>Proposal for Chile, Colombia, Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/13</td>
<td>Proposal for El Salvador, Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/13/Add.1</td>
<td>Project formulation grant for El Salvador, Honduras</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The summary information on the proposals is contained in the Table 2 below.
Table 2: Project proposals submitted to the intersessional review cycle between the thirty-third and thirty-fourth Adaptation Fund Board meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Full Proposals: Single-country</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>Grant Size, USD</th>
<th>IE Fee, USD</th>
<th>IE Fee %</th>
<th>Execution Cost, USD</th>
<th>EC %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia(1)</td>
<td>Kemitraan</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/2</td>
<td>835,465</td>
<td>64,758</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>68,373</td>
<td>8.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia(2)</td>
<td>Kemitraan</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/3</td>
<td>4,127,065</td>
<td>55,771</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>353,217</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>CDB</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/4</td>
<td>9,858,570</td>
<td>705,325</td>
<td>7.11%</td>
<td>855,310</td>
<td>9.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/5</td>
<td>9,865,651</td>
<td>722,885</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>829,839</td>
<td>9.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People’s Democratic Republic</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/6</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>430,876</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>481,567</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/7</td>
<td>9,999,894</td>
<td>783,402</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>875,850</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/8</td>
<td>9,916,925</td>
<td>776,902</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>182,200</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/9</td>
<td>9,996,441</td>
<td>783,131</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>776,000</td>
<td>8.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/10</td>
<td>7,000,040</td>
<td>548,390</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>559,000</td>
<td>8.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67,100,051</td>
<td>4,921,440</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,981,356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Full Proposals: Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda</td>
<td>OSS</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/11</td>
<td>13,079,540</td>
<td>1,024,660</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>1,045,860</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile, Colombia</td>
<td>WMO</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/12</td>
<td>7,432,250</td>
<td>582,250</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>9.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,511,790</td>
<td>1,606,910</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,695,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Concepts: Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador, Honduras</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/13</td>
<td>13,900,478</td>
<td>1,088,978</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>1,111,500</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,900,478</td>
<td>1,088,978</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,111,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Project Formulation Grants: Regional Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador, Honduras</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/13/ Add 1</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL (1+2+3+4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101,592,319</td>
<td>7,617,328</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,788,716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

Single-country projects and programmes

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; Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan); IDN/NIE/Food/2017/1; US$ 835,465).

5. The objective of the proposed project is to increase community resilience to food security in Saddang Watershed, as an effort to adapt to climate change. The project includes the following components:

   a) Strengthened Social Forestry in encouraging forest food in the upstream of Saddang watershed which has implications for the improvement of the environment and the increase of people’s income.
   b) Improved coastal governance and carrying capacity in support of climate change adaptation downstream of Saddang watershed.
   c) Strengthened crosscutting policies in ensuring the sustainability of climate change adaptation.
   d) Capacity building and stakeholder support on climate change adaptation through knowledge dissemination and management.

6. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by Kemitraan to the request made by the technical review;
   b) Approve the funding of US$ 835,465 for the implementation of the project requested by Kemitraan; and
   c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with Kemitraan as the national implementing entity for the project. The agreement should include a commitment from Kemitraan that, prior to first disbursement, Kemitraan will submit a revised gender assessment in line with the Adaptation Fund environmental and social policy and gender policy, and an environmental and social management plan outlining clear roles and responsibilities for implementation and adaptive management.

(Recommendation PPRC.24-25/1)
Regular proposals:

Indonesia (2): Building Coastal City Resilience to Climate Change Impacts and Natural Disasters in Pekalongan City, Central Java Province (Fully-developed project; Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan); IDN/NIE/Multi/2017/1; US$ 4,169,998)

7. The objective of the proposed project is to build coastal resilience to climate change impacts and natural disasters with a particular focus on pro-poor adaptation actions that involve and benefit the most vulnerable communities of the city. It plans to reach this objective through a combination of hard and soft adaptation measures, distilled along different governance level (national, provincial, city and village level), reflected respectively in each of the four program components. Adaptation interventions remains to be precisely determined, but information provided include developing alternative livelihoods (such as shrimp and fish production), constructing coastal embankments structures, developing eco-tourism, and building capacity of different stakeholders to integrated climate chance adaptation into various planning processes. The project proposal is structured around four components:

a) Village level - Enhancing coastal community capacity in developing and implementing Climate change adaptation actions and village information system;

b) City level - Enhancing local government and other city stakeholders’ capacity in developing local climate change adaptation action plan (RAD API) and implement Climate smart initiatives;

c) Province Level - Strengthening vertical coordination by enhancing provincial government’s capacity in mainstreaming climate change adaptation and resilience into Central Java Province development plan which in turn could foster better climate-related policy on climate financing and bottom-up planning;

d) National Level - Strengthening vertical coordination and collaboration between national and local government in climate adaptation context and Enriching knowledge, toolkits and methodologies coastal resilience for the national government.

8. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board to:

a) Not approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the 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 ensure compliance with the Fund’s guidance on unidentified sub-projects;

   (ii) The proponent should further demonstrate how the program interventions would meet national legislation regarding Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs);

   (iii) The proposal should further comply with the Fund’s Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy, and the Funds guidance on costs and fees.

c) Request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Indonesia.
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; Caribbean Development Bank (CDB); LCA/NIE/Agric/2019/1; US$ 9,858,570)

9. The objective of the proposed project is to build adaptive capacities of agro-ecosystems and livelihoods to threats posed by climate change climate variability, with projections for significant decreases in rainfall, intensive hydro-meteorological events and increasing droughts. It also aims to contribute to the growth indicators for agriculture. The project seeks to achieve this goal through the following three (3) main components:

   a) Building resilience and sustainability of farming systems through interventions for water security, soil conservation and management;
   b) Establishing green agro-parks, including the use of solar energy, for increased efficiency in resilient farming systems; and
   c) Knowledge management and transfer for capacity-building to institutional and local level adaptive capacities.

10. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) to the request made by the technical review;
   b) Approve the funding of US$ 9,858,570 for the implementation of the project requested by CDB; and
   c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with the CDB as the regional implementing entity for the project. The agreement should include a commitment from CDB that, CDB will undertake a revised gender assessment and the environmental and social management plan in the format complying with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund during the inception phase. Further disbursements will be conditioned upon the submission of these documents.

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Regular proposals
Iran (Islamic Republic of): Reducing Vulnerability to Climate Change in the Lake Bakhtaran Basin
(Fully-developed project; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); IRN/MIE/Water/2018/1; US$ 9,865,651)

11. The objective of the proposed project is to increase the resilience of communities and the natural environment of the Bakhtegan Basin to climate variability and change through integrated landscape management. The project proposal is structured around four components. The first component will strengthen knowledge of climate risk, climate change and the environmental situation to support development of long-term climate resilience in the Bakhtegan Basin using a decision support system. The second component will strengthen the resilience of communities in the Bakhtegan Basin through community empowerment and implementation of climate smart agriculture and alternative livelihoods. The third will strengthen resilience of local ecosystems through targeted interventions in key locations and the fourth will reinforce capacity at the local, regional and national level for improved governance and decision making in relation to climate risk management and effective implementation of adaptation measures.

12. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board 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 explain how the project will meet relevant national standards that would apply to the project interventions;

      (ii) The proposal should explain the rationale for not fully identifying the activities of components 2 and 3 prior to the submission of the funding application;

      (iii) The proposal should identify and manage environmental and social risks in line with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Adaptation Fund. In particular, it should describe how it will achieve this for the USPs and explain how it will comply with the AF Gender Policy for these USPs.

   c) Request UNDP to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

   (Recommendation PPRC.24-25/4)

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

13. The objective of the proposed project is to build resilience to climate change in communities along the east-west economic corridor in the central region of Lao PDR. The proponents aim to achieve this through the provision of climate-resilient infrastructure and the mainstreaming of climate action into urban planning. The first component aims to develop town-level master plans
that integrate climate change adaptation into socially-inclusive infrastructure development, spatial planning and land-use, while building planning capacities at multiple scales to plan for climate resilient infrastructure development and maintain and manage infrastructure. The second component aims to build socially-inclusive infrastructure in two target towns, to protect people from climate change related impacts and provide continuous services despite current and anticipated future changes in the climate. The third component aims to enhance knowledge and awareness from national to local economic corridor wide levels, seeking to ensure sustainability and influence policy changes at the national level.

14. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Approve the fully-developed project proposal, 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) Approve the funding of US$ 5,500,000 for the implementation of the project requested by UN-Habitat; and

   c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UN-Habitat as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

   (Recommendation PPRC.24-25/5)

Lesotho: Improving Adaptive Capacity of Vulnerable and Food-insecure Populations in Lesotho (Fully-developed project; The World Food Programme (WFP); LSO/MIE/Food/2018/1; US$9,999,891)

15. The objective of the proposed project is to enhance the adaptive capacity and build the resilience of vulnerable and food insecure households and communities to the impacts of climate change on food security. The project will achieve this by pursuing the following three objectives:

   a) Strengthening government capacities to generate climate information and promote its use to forecast risks of climate shocks, mobilise early action, and co-develop tailored and locally relevant climate services for communities;

   b) Raising awareness of communities, women, youth, people living with HIV, and other vulnerable groups on the impacts of climate change, the importance of adaptation, and the use of climate information for seasonal planning and climate risk management; and

   c) Designing and implementing, through a community-based planning process, local resilience and adaptation plans focusing on robust asset creation schemes, income diversification and market linkages, for increased adaptive capacity and household resilience.

16. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the World Food Programme (WFP) to the request made by the technical review;
b) Approve the funding of US$ 9,999,891 for the implementation of the project requested by WFP; and

c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with WFP as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

(Recommendation PPRC.24-25/6)

Sierra Leone: Promoting Climate Resilience in the Cocoa and Rice Sectors as an Adaptation Strategy in Sierra Leone (Fully-developed project; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); SLE/MIE/Multi/2018/1/PD; US$ 9,916,925)

17. The objective of the proposed project was to provide integrated solutions by testing climate resilient rice and cocoa. It intends to provide integrated solutions to the key issues from climate change in Lofa County (the breadbasket of the country) by testing integrated climate resilient rice and cocoa in partnership with all actors along the value chain. The proposed project is complementary to other IFAD investments on food security and livelihood opportunities which is being supported by the IFAD -funded Agricultural Value Chain Development Project (AVDP).

18. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board to:

a) 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) Approve the funding of US$ 9,916,925 for the implementation of the project requested by IFAD; and

c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with IFAD as the Multilateral Implementing Entity.

(Recommendation PPRC.24-25/7)

Tajikistan: An Integrated Landscape Approach to Enhancing the Climate Resilience of Small-scale Farmers and Pastoralists in Tajikistan (Fully-developed project; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); TJK/MIE/Rural/2018/1; US$ 9,996,441)

19. The project seeks to address the negative impacts of climate change on the livelihoods of small-scale rural farmers and pastoralists in the Kofirnighan River Basin (KRB), by developing and then implementing a climate-resilient catchment management strategy for the area. The project is trying to address the problem of climate change induced negative impacts on livelihoods of small-scale rural farmers and pastoralists in the Kofirnighan River Basin (KRB). It aims to make rural farmers and pastoralists climate resilient by developing and then implementing a climate-resilient catchment management strategy for the KRB, which will enhance the provision of ecosystem services in the river basin.

20. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board 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 $9,996,441 for the implementation of the project requested by UNDP; and

c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UNDP as the Multilateral Implementing Entity.

(Recommendation PPRC.24-25/8)

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

21. The objective of the proposed project is to improve climate resilience among smaller private sector farmers through strengthening the enabling environment, expanding climate resilient extension services and creating demonstration sites to support communities across farming systems in Turkmenistan. The project has three components: 1. Mainstreaming climate resilience into policy and institutional framework 2. Development of climate resilient extension services, and 3. Demonstration plots and community level investment into adaptation technologies.

22. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board 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 clarify how some of the ESP risks findings are substantiated;

   (ii) The proposal should ensure that the environmental and social risks identification and management process for the identified adaptation measures as well as for the USPs is clearly outlined in the environmental and social management plan of the project, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy of the Fund.

c) Request UNDP to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Turkmenistan.

(Recommendation PPRC.24-25/9)

Regional projects and programmes

Fully-developed proposals

Proposals from Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs)
Djibouti, Kenya, Uganda, Sudan: Strengthening Drought Resilience of Small Holder Farmers and Pastoralists in the IGAD Region (Project concept; Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); AFR/RIE/DRR/2017/1; US$ 13,079,540)

23. The objective of the project is to increase the resilience of smallholder farmers and pastoralists to climate change risks mainly those related to drought, through establishment of appropriate early warning systems and implementation of drought adaptation actions in the four targeted countries IGAD region.

24. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Not approve the fully-developed proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); to the request made by the technical review;

   b) Suggest that OSS reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues:

      (i) The project document should clarify the applicable national technical standards and how these will be complied with.

      (ii) The project document should provide further clarifications on the consultation process with respect to indigenous peoples and, provide further information on marginalized and vulnerable groups, ecosystems and biodiversity assets.

      (iii) The project document should consolidate and complete the information on an Environment and Social Management Plan (ESMP) that includes the safeguard measures that have already been identified, as well as the process for ESP and GP compliance for the unidentified sub projects (USPs).

   c) Request OSS to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Governments of Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda.

      (Recommendation PPRC.24-25/10)

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Chile, Colombia, Peru: Enhancing Adaptive Capacity of Andean Communities through Climate Services (ENANDES) (Fully-developed project proposal; World Meteorological Organization (WMO) LAC/MIE/DRR/2018/2; US$ 7,432,250)

25. The objective of the proposed project is to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience of the Andean communities in Colombia, Peru and Chile to climate variability and change by implementing climate-smart decision-making networks for better disaster risk, hydropower generation and agriculture management. It will aim to achieve this objective by:
a) Increasing the technical capacity of the NMHSs of Colombia, Peru and Chile to generate and disseminate end-to-end and communities demand-driven weather, climate and hydrological services;

b) Enhancing national and local inter-institutional/sectorial stakeholder networks to co-design and co-produce sector specific climate information in support of disaster risk management, long-term adaptation and water, food, and energy security;

c) Empowering local communities to use the weather and climate information for local risk management and adaptation plans;

d) Strengthening regional cooperation for mutual technical assistance among NMHSs, alignment with other complementary initiatives in the Andean region, and foster capacity building on data management, climate prediction, and tailored sectorial information.

26. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board to:

a) Approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) to the request made by the technical review;

b) Approve the funding of US$ 7,432,250 for the implementation of the project requested by WMO; and

c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with WMO as a multilateral implementing entity for the project. The agreement should include a commitment from WMO that, prior to first disbursement, WMO will submit: i) a brief action plan describing how the project will take action in line with the Free, Prior and Informed Consent principle, to establish bottom up participation and consultation of the Indigenous groups; ii) a revision of the project outputs, as well as the results framework and budget to reflect the gender baseline assessment as a specific activity; and iii) a revision of the environmental and social impact assessment and plan to include a comprehensive risk identification and assessment in line with the ESP principles of the Fund, rather than by project activity.

(Recommendation PPRC.24-25/11)

Concept proposals

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

El Salvador, Honduras: Improve Livelihood Resilience through Community-based Climate Change Adaptation in the Transboundary Watershed of Goascorán in El Salvador and Honduras (Concept note; World Food Programme (WFP); LAC/MIE/Food/2018/PD/1; US$ 14,000,000)

27. The objective of the proposed project is to strengthen the climate change adaptive capacity of vulnerable households in the degraded transboundary watershed of Goascorán across El Salvador and Honduras by providing communities with integrated climate risk management tools and services that enhance their resilience to climate risks. The Project will promote climate change adaptation strategies in the transboundary watershed by: Enabling environment for the implementation of climate change adaptation mechanisms in the Goascorán watershed; and
Providing an Integrated climate change adaptation strategy to vulnerable women, men, boys and girls and wider communities in the Goascorán watershed. The project plans to strengthen binational, national and local governance capacities on climate change adaptation measures implementation in the Goascorán Watershed and improve the adaptive capacity of vulnerable households and communities, through the introduction of climate change adaptation best practices, climate services and climate risks financing strategies.

28. The Project and Programme Review Committee decided to recommend to the Board to:

a) Not endorse the concept note, 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 better demonstrate cost-effectiveness and justify the amount of funding that is being requested;

   (ii) The proposal should emphasize concrete adaptation interventions, particularly at the local level, while carefully reconsidering the proposed interventions at the centralized level and particularly relating to the issue of governance; and

   (iii) The proposal should consider the sustainability of the project, including pathways to replication and scaling up.

c) Not approve the project formulation grant of US$ 80,000;

d) Request WFP to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Governments of El Salvador and Honduras.

(Recommendation PPRC.22-23/12)
Table 3: Summary of PPRC 24-25 funding decisions recommendations to the Adaptation Fund Board (June 24, 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Full Proposals: Single-country</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>NIE funding, USD</th>
<th>RIE funding, USD</th>
<th>MIE funding, USD</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Funding set aside, USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>Saint Lucia</td>
<td>CDB</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/4</td>
<td>9,858,570</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>9,858,570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Full Proposals: Regional</th>
<th>Region/Countries</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>RIE funding, USD</th>
<th>MIE funding, USD</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Funding set aside, USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIE</td>
<td>Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda</td>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/11</td>
<td>13,079,540</td>
<td>Not approve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>Chile, Colombia, Peru</td>
<td>WMO</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/12</td>
<td>7,432,250</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>7,432,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Concepts: Regional</th>
<th>Region/Countries</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>RIE funding, USD</th>
<th>MIE funding, USD</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Funding set aside, USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>El Salvador, Honduras</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/13</td>
<td>13,900,478</td>
<td>Not endorse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Project Formulation Grants: Regional Concepts</th>
<th>Region/Countries</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>RIE funding, USD</th>
<th>MIE funding, USD</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Funding set aside, USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>El Salvador, Honduras</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.24-25/13/Add.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,962,530</td>
<td>22,938,110</td>
<td>73,611,679</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-total, USD | 4,962,530 | 9,858,570 | 52,278,951 | 46,107,295 |