



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.25/15
30 September, 2019

Adaptation Fund Board
Project and Programme Review Committee
Twenty-Fifth Meeting
Bonn, Germany, 7-9 October, 2019

Agenda Item 4 I)

PROPOSAL FOR BELIZE

Background

1. The Operational Policies and Guidelines (OPG) for Parties to Access Resources from the Adaptation Fund (the Fund), adopted by the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), state in paragraph 45 that regular adaptation project and programme proposals, i.e. those that request funding exceeding US\$ 1 million, would undergo either a one-step, or a two-step approval process. In case of the one-step process, the proponent would directly submit a fully-developed project proposal. In the two-step process, the proponent would first submit a brief project concept, which would be reviewed by the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) and would have to receive the endorsement of the Board. In the second step, the fully-developed project/programme document would be reviewed by the PPRC, and would ultimately require the Board's approval.

2. The Templates approved by the Board (Annex 5 of the OPG, as amended in March 2016) do not include a separate template for project and programme concepts but provide that these are to be submitted using the project and programme proposal template. The section on Adaptation Fund Project Review Criteria states:

For regular projects using the two-step approval process, only the first four criteria will be applied when reviewing the 1st step for regular project concept. In addition, the information provided in the 1st step approval process with respect to the review criteria for the regular project concept could be less detailed than the information in the request for approval template submitted at the 2nd step approval process. Furthermore, a final project document is required for regular projects for the 2nd step approval, in addition to the approval template.

3. The first four criteria mentioned above are:

- (i) Country Eligibility,
- (ii) Project Eligibility,
- (iii) Resource Availability, and
- (iv) Eligibility of NIE/MIE.

4. The fifth criterion, applied when reviewing a fully-developed project document, is:
(v) Implementation Arrangements.

5. It is worth noting that at the twenty-second Board meeting, the Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) of the Fund was approved and at the twenty-seventh Board meeting, the Gender Policy (GP) of the Fund was also approved. Consequently, compliance with both the ESP and the GP has been included in the review criteria both for concept documents and fully-developed project documents. The proposal template was revised as well, to include sections requesting demonstration of compliance of the project/programme with the ESP and the GP.

6. At its seventeenth meeting, the Board decided (Decision B.17/7) to approve "Instructions for preparing a request for project or programme funding from the Adaptation Fund", contained in the Annex to document AFB/PPRC.8/4, which further outlines applicable review criteria for both

concepts and fully-developed proposals. The latest version of this document was launched in conjunction with the revision of the Operational Policies and Guidelines in November 2013.

7. Based on the Board Decision B.9/2, the first call for project and programme proposals was issued and an invitation letter to eligible Parties to submit project and programme proposals to the Fund was sent out on April 8, 2010.

8. According to the Board Decision B.12/10, a project or programme proposal needs to be received by the secretariat no less than nine weeks before a Board meeting, in order to be considered by the Board in that meeting.

9. The following project concept document titled “Enhancing the Resilience of Belize’s Coastal Communities to Climate Change Impacts” by the Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT), which is the National Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund.

10. This is the first submission of the proposal using the two-step submission process.

11. The current submission was received by the secretariat in time to be considered in the thirty-fourth Board meeting. The secretariat carried out a technical review of the project proposal, assigned it the diary number BLZ/NIE/CZM/2019/1, and completed a review sheet.

12. In accordance with a request to the secretariat made by the Board in its 10th meeting, the secretariat shared this review sheet with PACT, and offered it the opportunity of providing responses before the review sheet was sent to the PPRC.

13. The secretariat is submitting to the PPRC the summary and, pursuant to decision B.17/15, the final technical review of the project, both prepared by the secretariat, along with the final submission of the proposal in the following section. In accordance with decision B.25.15, the proposal is submitted with changes between the initial submission and the revised version highlig



ADAPTATION FUND

ADAPTATION FUND BOARD SECRETARIAT TECHNICAL REVIEW OF PROJECT/PROGRAMME PROPOSAL

PROJECT/PROGRAMME CATEGORY: Regular-sized Concept

Country/Region: **Belize**
 Project Title: **Enhancing the Resilience of Belize's Coastal Communities to Climate Change Impacts**
 Thematic Focal Area: **Coastal management**
 Implementing Entity: **Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT)**
 Executing Entities: **National Climate Change Office, Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute**
 AF Project ID: **BLZ/NIE/CZM/2019/1**
 IE Project ID: **<IE to fill out>** Requested Financing from Adaptation Fund (US Dollars): **4,000,000**
 Reviewer and contact person: **Bianka Kretschmer** Co-reviewer(s): **Fareeha Iqbal, Martina Dorigo**
 IE Contact Person: **Nayari Diaz-Perez**

Technical Summary	<p>Overall the project concept “Enhancing the Resilience of Belize’s Coastal Communities to Climate Change Impacts” shows potential to address the high vulnerability of Belize’s coastal communities through a multi-sector and systemic approach to building coastal resiliency, including local and national knowledge and capacity-building approach for ensuring long-term sustainability. The project aims to this through the following components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improving coastal land use for resilient habitation and sectoral activities 2. Coastal vulnerability monitoring 3. Beach stabilisation of high-risk coastal areas 4. Awareness raising, knowledge dissemination and capacity-strengthening <p>The initial technical review found that the proposal needed to address some issues as listed above in this review sheet, which can be summarized as follows:</p> <p>The climate change rationale needed to be made clearer and project components should be made more coherent. In addition, the proposal needed to specify: i) who are project beneficiaries and what is the target area;</p>
--------------------------	---

ii) what are the specific observed and projected climate risks are for the project area; iii) how the communities are vulnerable, to what impacts, and which risks are likely to be exacerbated or introduced over time by climate change; iv) how the proposed policy and monitoring measures will tie in with needed and proposed adaptation actions on the ground, and v) how community vulnerability to climate change will be reduced. The proposal also needed to strengthen its cost-effectiveness potential and needs to better inform the expected economic and social benefits for the target communities. An initial environmental and social screening and gender relevant information were lacking and the IEs management fee and project execution cost had to be adjusted, to be in line with the AF policies and guidelines.

The final technical review finds that the majority of the comments previously raised have been sufficiently addressed for this stage. The proposal now presents a clearer climate change rationale and project components are more coherent. It is recommended that:

- (i) The fully developed proposal should provide even further clarity on which elements will have localized benefits and which will support national/sub-national systems (while anchoring the proposed actions soundly in needed measures to respond to climate change impacts), in order to identify the number of direct and indirect beneficiaries;
- (ii) The fully developed proposal should provide more information on the underlying drivers of vulnerability and how these will be addressed in the target areas;
- (iii) The risk screening for the principles of “gender equity and women’s empowerment; indigenous people; and marginalized and vulnerable groups” and mitigation measures should be better informed through the gender and social assessment that will be undertaken; and
- (iv) The proposal should strengthen its full-cost of adaptation reasoning, with a comprehensive value-added analysis against the current (baseline) situation.

The proposal also requested USD 29,830 in project formulation grant funding and USD 20,000 in project formulation assistance funding.

Date:

September 12, 2019

Review Criteria	Questions	Comments 23 August 2019	Comments 12 September 2019
Country Eligibility	1. Is the country party to the Kyoto Protocol?	Yes.	
	2. Is the country a developing country particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change?	Yes. As a Caribbean low-lying coastal state, Belize is highly vulnerable to increasing climate change impacts which undermine the country's economic and social development: changes in the intensity, distribution and frequency of extreme weather events, such as storms and hurricanes; sea level rise, erosion and saline intrusion, storm surges and flooding; droughts and wildfires; increased sea surface temperature, ocean acidification and coral bleaching; changes in crop production etc. Concrete and innovative adaptation actions are required to increase the currently low resilience of vulnerable coastal communities and national economic sectors such as tourism, fisheries and agriculture. Belize's Third National Communications to the UNFCCC has identified its coastal ecosystems as the area of the country that is most susceptible to adverse impacts of climate change.	
Project Eligibility	3. Has the designated government authority for the Adaptation Fund endorsed the project/programme?	Yes. As per the Endorsement letter by Mr. Joseph Waight, Designated Authority for the Adaptation Fund in Belize, dated August 1, 2019.	

	4. Does the length of the proposal amount to no more than Fifty pages for the project/programme concept, including its annexes; or One hundred pages for the fully-developed project document, and one hundred pages for its annexes?	Yes. The concept is 26 pages total, including annexes.	The concept is at 45 pages in total, including annexes.

	<p>5. Does the project / programme support concrete adaptation actions to assist the country in addressing adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change and build in climate resilience?</p>	<p>Not clear at this stage. Overall, the project will enhance coastal land use, habitation, monitoring, and integrated planning, as well as information and capacity-building of stakeholders on best adaptation practices in Belize. The aim is to increase climate resilience of coastal communities and affected economic sectors such as tourism, fisheries and agriculture. However, there is no discussion on who is at risk and from what threats. A baseline scenario, identifying the current situation needs to be further informed, as well as how this will be impacted by climate change in the years to come.</p> <p>Additionally, it is not yet clear which communities are being targeted as beneficiaries and how the project is addressing their adaptation needs. How many people and/or km of coastline are expected to benefit? Whose specific vulnerabilities will be addressed by the project and how? does the project target the entire coastal population of Belize (53,234 males and 55,039 females) and all 25 coastal communities as project locations? Will some activities be carried out also in the outer islands? For component three, two coastal</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>communities will be selected: when and how?</p> <p>In addition, the majority of the project grant seems targeted at policy improvements, assessments and monitoring, rather than concrete adaptation investments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Component 1 (\$1M), the concept proposes to strengthen integrated coastal zone management. What does it mean that “the implementation of the ICZMP and the associated guidelines for zonation will be strengthened”? What forms will “implementation” take in this project? - In Component 2 (\$1M), the concept proposes supporting monitoring of saline intrusion, monitoring of beach erosion, and enhancement of a flood/storm surge EWS. - Component 3 (\$1M) contains concrete investments, in the form of recovery of beach area lost due to coastal erosion. How many communities will benefit? What is the situation they face currently and will face in the future, given climate change, and what adaptation benefits will be achieved by recovery? 	
			<p>CR1: Addressed. Information has been provided on the risks posed by</p>

		<p>CR1: The proposal should reinforce its rationale in relation to the climate scenario outlined. A baseline scenario, identifying the current situation needs to be further informed, as well as how this will be impacted by climate change in the years to come.</p> <p>CR2: Further inform the implementation of the ICZMP and the associated guidelines for zonation.</p> <p>CR3: Please clarify the number of expected beneficiaries (disaggregated by sex) including an initial assessment of how target groups will be identified.</p> <p>CR4: Clarify the selection criteria for the project target areas. In addition, if any, please describe any non-climatic drivers of vulnerability and barriers to adaptation that might be relevant for project design.</p>	<p>climate change and how the project will address these, as well as on the vulnerability and number of communities and community members.</p> <p>CR2: Addressed. Information on the implementation of the ICZMP and its guidelines have been provided in the components table and Part II, A, component 1.</p> <p>CR3 & 4: Partially addressed. Throughout components one, two, and four of the project the target beneficiaries include residents of all 27 coastal communities identified, this includes the 57,787 males and 60,035 females in these communities. Specific target groups in each community will be identified by developing criteria for selection. However, for the fully developed proposal a description of any non-climatic drivers of vulnerability and barriers to adaptation that might be relevant for project design, should be provided.</p>
	6. Does the project / programme provide economic, social and environmental benefits, particularly to vulnerable	Broadly the project provides a number of economic, social and environmental benefits to Belize's coastal area, such as increased protection of coastal and marine ecosystems and biodiversity,	CR5: Addressed. The project will support measures that will yield socio-economic benefits such as sustainable tourism, resilient housing,

	<p>communities, including gender considerations, while avoiding or mitigating negative impacts, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p>protected lives and livelihoods of 40 per cent of the country's population and the sustainable development of several productive economic sectors. However, specific economic and social benefits that are expected should be better explained based on the current situation of economic vulnerabilities and risks, which have not been adequately discussed.</p> <p>CR5: Specific economic and social expected benefits need to be better explained.</p> <p>CR6: To comply with the AF ESP and Gender Policy, the concept would further require an initial environmental</p>	<p>potable water, and greater resilience of fishing communities. The early warning system will reduce risks to lives and health. Environmental benefits include improved biodiversity through enhanced and integrated coastal planning; improved management of mangroves; prevention of unregulated development, including industry; reduction in coastal degradation from shoreline protection measures, and reduced saline intrusion in freshwater systems.</p> <p>CR6: Addressed. An initial screening has been provided.</p>
--	---	---	---

		<p>and social screening, including information on different vulnerable groups in high-risk coastal areas and how climate change impacts these groups differently.</p>	
	<p>7. Is the project / programme cost effective?</p>	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>The proposal has the potential for cost-effectiveness of the proposed measures due to the multi-sector and systemic approach to building coastal resiliency, as well as the local and national knowledge and capacity-building approach for ensuring long-term sustainability.</p> <p>However, it lacks explanation on what basis these measures were selected among alternative options. The proposal mentions the aim of building on existing structures to ensure cost-effectiveness. It is not clear why the</p>	

		<p>policy/monitoring components (1 and 2) require the same AF grant allocation (\$1 M each) as the concrete investment-related component (3).</p> <p>CR7: Please provide more information why these measures were selected and on the budget allocation of the different components.</p>	<p>CR7: Addressed. The explanation provided is sufficient and budget allocations for each component have been provided.</p>
	<p>8. Is the project / programme consistent with national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or sub-national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments?</p>	<p>Yes. The project is strategically aligned with national and sectoral climate and development strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Growth and Sustainable Development Strategy - National Climate Change Policy, Strategy and Action Plan - Third National Communication to UNFCCC - Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) - The project will contribute to SDGs 6 - Clean Water and Sanitation, 11 – Sustainable Cities and Communities and 13 – Climate Action. 	
	<p>9. Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable, in compliance with the Environmental</p>	<p>Likely, yes. The project will ensure that activities are properly assessed to determine the necessity for an Environmental Impact Assessment, in line with the EIA Regulations of the Subsidiary Laws of Belize (2003).</p>	

	and Social Policy of the Fund?		
	10. Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?	<p>The proposal makes a good case for how the proposed activities will build on and work in synergy with other projects and funding sources, including the AF-funded project on marine conservation and climate adaptation and the IDB-funded project on capacity-building for climate vulnerability reduction.</p> <p>CR8: Further information is requested on synergistic alignment and confirmed lack of duplication with the following two concept notes in pipeline with the GCF (i) “Mainstreaming Coral Reef Resilience and Restoration as an Ecosystem-based Adaptation Strategy to Climate Change in the Caribbean Region” (Belize is a participating country); and (ii) “Enhancing Coastal Resilience Against Climate Change” (Belize is a participating country).</p>	<p>CR8: The NIE has clarified that synergies with the pipelined GCF projects will be kept in mind during project development.</p>
	11. Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?	<p>Yes. The project has a dedicated KM component that focuses on awareness raising, knowledge dissemination and national capacity strengthening through developing a National Climate Change Communication Strategy and Action Plan. Lessons learnt from the project will also be documented in the form of</p>	<p>CR9: Sufficient at concept stage and will be elaborated on by proposal stage.</p>

		<p>knowledge products to be disseminated. Training modules will be developed for best coastal adaptation practices. This component also aims at strengthening the executing entity's institutional capacity to utilise information systems for national monitoring of erosion.</p> <p>CR9: This needs to be much more fully articulated by full proposal stage, with a description of the expected knowledge management (KM) outlets, which stakeholder group each will target, how "lines of communication" will be kept open for implementation of Component 3, and how the KM efforts will be sustainable.</p>	
	<p>12. Has a consultative process taken place, and has it involved all key stakeholders, and vulnerable groups, including gender considerations in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p>Yes, this is adequate for a concept stage.</p> <p>The consultative process included all relevant national level stakeholders. It is planned to conduct extensive stakeholder consultations with relevant communities, including indigenous communities, taking into account the AF gender policy, during full proposal development.</p> <p>To this end, PFA and PFG grants are requested for stakeholder</p>	

		<p>consultations and gender/ social assessments. Nevertheless, at concept note stage, preliminary stakeholder consultation and an initial gender assessment should be reflected (see CAR 1).</p>	
	<p>13. Is the requested financing justified on the basis of full cost of adaptation reasoning?</p>	<p>Likely. Planning without considerations of climate variability and change and poor infrastructure development and coastal erosion compounded by sea level rise already affect heavily populated coastal areas, which will be exacerbated by future climate impacts and strongly impacting coastal communities.</p> <p>CR10: For full project development, the full cost of adaptation reasoning should be more detailed and demonstrated for each component. How does the project situation compare to the baseline situation? How will this be achieved irrespective of other funding sources?</p> <p>CR11: For component 1, it is not clear what all “four years of implementation” of the legal framework entails, and why it would cost \$1 M. Please discuss.</p>	<p>CR 10: Partially addressed.</p> <p>The proposal further describes the added value of the proposed activities and how these will help people adapt to the negative effects of climate change, but a value-added analysis against the current (baseline) situation was not comprehensive.</p> <p>CR11: Addressed.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project / program aligned with AF’s results framework?</p>	<p>No information has been provided as part of project objectives.</p>	

		<p>There is potential for the project to align with outcomes 1 (reduced exposure), 2 (strengthened institutional capacity), 3 (strengthened awareness and ownership at local level) and 7 (improved policies and regulations) of the AF RF.</p> <p>CR12: Please provide information on the project's alignment with the AF results framework under the section "project objectives".</p>	<p>CR12: Addressed.</p> <p>The proposal is aligned with outcome 2,3,5 and 7 of the AF results framework.</p>
	<p>15. Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?</p>	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>CR13: Please discuss how the monitoring activities identified in Component 2 will sustain after project completion.</p> <p>CR14: Is there potential of scaling up and replication of project activities?</p>	<p>CR13: Sufficiently addressed at this stage.</p> <p>Beach erosion monitoring will be sustained by creating a community network to collect data and conduct on the ground monitoring.</p> <p>In addition, the training and provision of equipment for selected NGOS, which are active in the project area and have good working relationship with Belize Coastal Zone Management Authority (CZMAI), will ensure sustainability and cost effectiveness as the monitoring parameters can be integrated into their monthly and annual monitoring protocols.</p>

			<p>Finally, the purchase of necessary equipment to undertake a coastal saline intrusion assessment during implementation of the project and for continued monitoring after completion by the Hydrology Department within the Ministry of Natural Resources, enables the government agency responsible for this assessment to carry out future studies beyond the life span of the project, which will be used to inform and support the formulation of a sustainable water resources development plan for Belize's groundwater resources.</p> <p>CR14: Sufficiently addressed at this stage.</p> <p>Under the beach rehabilitation component, lessons learnt will be thoroughly documented and a mechanism for replication will be developed.</p>
	<p>16. Does the project / programme provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?</p>	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>The project activities have not yet been identified to the point where comprehensive risks identification is possible. Therefore, the conclusions provided through the initial screening provided in the table under section K, are not substantiated.</p>	

		<p>The project seems to include activities with inherent risks (e.g. the costal restoration measures under project component 3), which are not fully identified at this stage. To this end, the project has been categorised as category B.</p> <p>In addition, no initial gender assessment has been provided. The proponent requested PFG and PFA grants to undertake a gender/social assessment during the preparation of the fully developed proposal, to comply with the AF GP. Nevertheless, at concept stage, an initial gender assessment is required.</p> <p>CR15: Please provide an initial environmental and social screening. The screening should determine whether or not the project requires further environmental and social assessment and risk management. In cases where environmental and social principles from the checklist are identified as not applicable to the project, requiring no further assessment for compliance, please provide justification.</p> <p>CAR1: Please provide gender relevant information, identifying roles, needs and available opportunities and</p>	<p>CR15: Sufficiently addressed at this stage. The ESP risk identification is now better substantiated. The principles of “marginalized and vulnerable groups; gender equity and women’s empowerment, and indigenous people” will be better informed upon completion of the gender and social assessment as well as in depth consultations with women and any minority group.</p> <p>CAR 1: Partially addressed. The proposal now includes a section where gender general information is</p>

		challenges or risks for men and women relevant to the project.	included. Even though this is not sufficient, it is noted that the proponent requested a PFG and PFA to undertake a gender assessment which will inform the fully developed proposal.
Resource Availability	17. Is the requested project / programme funding within the cap of the country?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The proponent requested also a PFG and a PFA. The PFG will be used to undertake consultations with 25 coastal communities and the PFA to undertake technical studies.</p> <p>CAR2: Please clarify the technical studies "FS" (assuming feasibility study) and "KAP" to be undertaken under the PFA. In addition, revise the PFA estimated completion date (which now is November 2020) for it to be in line with the estimated completion date indicated in the PFG (April 2020). To recall, the PFG/PFA estimated ending dates should be prior to the estimated project inception date.</p>	CAR2: Addressed. The PFA has been revised. The proponent will conduct a feasibility study and a gender/social assessment.
	18. Is the Implementing Entity Management Fee at or below 8.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget before the fee?	No. It is 9.3%.	Addressed.
	19. Are the Project/Programme Execution Costs at or	No. It is 10.4%.	Addressed.

	below 9.5 per cent of the total project/programme budget (including the fee)?		
Eligibility of IE	20. Is the project/programme submitted through an eligible Implementing Entity that has been accredited by the Board?	Yes.	
Implementation Arrangements	21. Is there adequate arrangement for project / programme management, in compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund?	n/a at concept stage	
	22. Are there measures for financial and project/programme risk management?	n/a at concept stage	
	23. Are there measures in place for the management of for environmental and social risks, in line with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund?	n/a at concept stage	
	24. Is a budget on the Implementing Entity Management Fee use included?	n/a at concept stage	
	25. Is an explanation and a breakdown of the execution costs included?	n/a at concept stage	

	26. Is a detailed budget including budget notes included?	n/a at concept stage	
	27. Are arrangements for monitoring and evaluation clearly defined, including budgeted M&E plans and sex-disaggregated data, targets and indicators, in compliance with the Gender Policy of the Fund?	n/a at concept stage	
	28. Does the M&E Framework include a break-down of how implementing entity IE fees will be utilized in the supervision of the M&E function?	n/a at concept stage	
	29. Does the project/programme's results framework align with the AF's results framework? Does it include at least one core outcome indicator from the Fund's results framework?	n/a at concept stage	
	30. Is a disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones included?	n/a at concept stage	



GOVERNMENT OF BELIZE
Ministry of Finance
Belmopan, Belize

C/GEN/120/01/19

August 8, 2019

The Adaptation Fund Board
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat
Email: Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

Dear Sir/Madam:

Subject: Endorsement of Project Formulation Grant and Project Formulation Assistance Grant for Concept “Enhancing the Resilience of Belize’s Coastal Communities to Climate Change Impacts.”

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Belize, I confirm that the above Project Formulation Grant (PFG) and Project Formulation Assistance (PFA) Grant Applications are in accordance with the government’s national priorities in implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in Belize.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above PFG and PFA Grant with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project will be implemented by Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT) and executed by the National Climate Change Office (NCCO) and the Coastal Zone Management Authority and Institute (CZMAI).

Sincerely

JOSEPH WAIGHT
Financial Secretary

