



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/22
18 August 2020

Adaptation Fund Board
Project and Programme Review Committee

**REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON INITIAL
SCREENING/TECHNICAL REVIEW
OF PROJECT AND PROGRAMME PROPOSALS
(PART II)**

Background

1. This document presents to the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) an overview of the project/programme proposals submitted by Implementing Entities (IE) to the review cycle for the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board and to the intersessional review cycle between the first and second parts of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board but that could not be processed during those review cycles in accordance with principles set by the Board for intersessional review of proposals. It also presents the process of screening and technical review undertaken by the secretariat.

2. In advance of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board and the intersessional review cycle between the first and second parts of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board, the secretariat received proposals for both single-country proposals as well as regional proposals as encouraged by Decision B.26/3, and as observed in Decisions B.27/5 and B.31/3, and reviewed them, as detailed further below.

3. However, due to the exceptional circumstances caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board could not take place as originally planned.

4. Instead, following the decision by the Board, a procedural virtual session was held during the initially scheduled days. In addition, the Board decided, through decision B.34-35/26, to hold the second session of the meeting from 23-26 June 2020. Due to the on-going pandemic, however, that session could not take place as scheduled.

5. Following the consultation between the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board and the PPRC as well as the secretariat, the chairpersons have endorsed a plan to consider the reviews intersessionally following the process established by the Board for intersessional review cycle. The processing of the projects that had been prepared for the consideration of the PPRC and subsequently the Board at the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board would therefore be finalized using the procedure used in the intersessional review cycle.

6. Of the projects that had been submitted in anticipation of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board, March 31-April 3, those that were eligible to be subsequently considered during the intersessional review cycle have been successfully processed (18 projects in total). However, eight projects submitted for that cycle could not be fully processed using the normal intersessional process as they were either first submissions or small grant proposals, and therefore ineligible to be considered under such a process.

7. In order to enable the processing of such projects without undue delay, the Board adopted a decision that would allow processing of such projects intersessionally using an *Ad Interim* process (Decision B.35.a-35.b/39 on *Ad Interim* Review Process to Consider First Submission Proposals and Small Grant Proposals in an Intersessional Project Review Cycle), which states as follows:

Recalling its decision B.34-35/26, and recognizing the extraordinary circumstances and challenges due to the outbreak of the novel coronavirus Covid-19 which have prevented organization of face-to-face meetings of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) and its two committees, as well as the need for the Adaptation Fund to continue serving its mandate, the Board may want to:

- a) *Take note of the fact that such proposals that were submitted to be considered at the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board originally scheduled for March 31st-April 3rd, 2020 and the second part of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board, originally scheduled for 23-26 June 2020, and*

that are eligible for being considered intersessionally following decisions B.23/15 and B.25/2, are submitted for intersessional consideration by the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC); and

decide to:

- b) Organize an Ad Interim Review Process, as described in document AFB/B.35.a-35.b/XX, in order to discuss and consider such proposals that have been submitted to be considered at the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board originally scheduled for March 31st-April 3rd, 2020 and the second part of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board, originally scheduled for 23-26 June 2020, and that are not eligible for being considered in accordance with the regular intersessional review process following decisions B.23/15 and B.25/2;*
- c) As part of the Ad Interim Review Process referred to in subparagraph (b) above, organize a virtual meeting of the Project and Programme Review Committee in the week of August 24, 2020; and*
- d) Consider, subject to specific decisions by the Board, using the above-mentioned process for future review cycles, in cases when the Board meeting cannot take place in a regular fashion.*

(Decision B.35.a-35.b/39)

8. Meanwhile, the secretariat received submissions in anticipation of the second session of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board in June, and prepared the technical reviews as per the intersessional and *Ad Interim* intersessional review processes.

9. The analysis of the submitted proposals, including those left over from the previous cycle, as described in paragraph 6 above, is contained in a separate addendum to this document.

Funding status and situation of the waitlist

10. At the twelfth meeting, the Board instituted a cap of 50 per cent for project funds directed through Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs), having decided:

(a) That the cumulative budget allocation for funding projects submitted by MIEs, should not exceed 50 per cent of the total funds available for funding decisions in the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund at the start of each session. That cumulative allocation would be subject to review by the Board on the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee at subsequent sessions;

(b) To request the Trustee to provide an update on the amount of funds that have been approved for projects implemented by NIEs and MIEs at each meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board; and

(c) To review the implementation of this decision at the fourteenth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board.

(Decision B.12/9)

11. In its seventeenth meeting, having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC), the Board decided to:

- (a) *Maintain the 50 per cent cap on the funding of projects/programmes implemented by MIEs established by decision B.12/9, and exclude project/programme concepts from the 50 per cent calculation; [...]*

(Decision B.17/19)

12. According to the latest Financial Report prepared by the Trustee as of 30 June 2020, the cumulative funding decisions for projects/programmes submitted by MIEs amounted to US\$ 441.44 million, and the cumulative funding decisions for all projects/programmes amounted to US\$ 744.58 million. Funds available to support AF Board funding decisions amounted to US\$ 167.19 million. The Board had instituted, through decision B.12/9, a cap of 50 per cent for projects/programmes submitted by MIEs. Some categories of proposals submitted by MIEs had been excluded from counting towards the 50 per cent, and the cumulative funding decisions for MIE projects/programmes that counted towards it amounted to US\$ 423.70 million. Therefore, the funds available below the 50 per cent cap currently amount to US\$ 32.19¹ million.

Funding Window for Regional Projects and Programmes

13. Since its inception and until March 2017, the Adaptation Fund Board had only approved projects and programmes implemented in individual countries. At its twenty-fifth meeting, the Board considered a proposal for a pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, and decided to:

- (a) *Approve the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, as contained in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2;*
- (b) *Set a cap of US\$ 30 million for the programme;*
- (c) *Request the secretariat to issue a call for regional project and programme proposals for consideration by the Board in its twenty-sixth meeting; [...]*

(Decision B.25/28)

14. In accordance with the decision B.25/28 and the document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2, the secretariat had issued, on 5 May 2015, an invitation to submit project and programme proposals for funding under the pilot programme. The invitation was sent to Designated Authorities for the Adaptation Fund, and to Multilateral and Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs) accredited by the Board.

15. The Board decided, at its twenty-sixth meeting,

¹ This figure represents the amount that remains available under the MIE cap after the regional proposal "Reducing Vulnerabilities of Populations in the Central Asia Region from Glacier Lake Outburst Floods in Changing Climate" from UNESCO is funded. This project is currently on the waitlist as per Decision B.35.a-35.b/25.

[...] to request the secretariat to inform the Multilateral Implementing Entities and Regional Implementing Entities that the call for proposals under the Pilot programme for Regional Projects and Programmes is still open and to encourage them to submit proposals to the AFB at its 27th meeting, bearing in mind the cap established by decision B.25/28.

(Decision B.26/3)

16. The Board considered, at its twenty-seventh meeting, at its twenty-seventh meeting, issues related to the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes and decided to:

- (a) Continue consideration of regional project and programme proposals under the pilot programme, while reminding the implementing entities that the amount set aside for the pilot programme is US\$ 30 million;*
- (b) Request the secretariat to prepare for consideration by the Project and Programme Review Committee at its nineteenth meeting, a proposal for prioritization among regional project/programme proposals, including for awarding project formulation grants, and for establishment of a pipeline; and*
- (c) Consider the matter of the pilot programme for regional projects and programmes at its twenty-eighth meeting.*

(Decision B.27/5)

17. The proposal requested in (b) above was presented to the nineteenth meeting of the PPRC as document AFB/PPRC.19/5. The Board subsequently decided:

(a) With regard to the pilot programme approved by decision B.25/28:

(i) To prioritize the four projects and 10 project formulation grants as follows:

1. If the proposals recommended to be funded in a given meeting of the PPRC do not exceed the available slots under the pilot programme, all those proposals would be submitted to the Board for funding;

2. If the proposals recommended to be funded in a given meeting of the PPRC do exceed the available slots under the pilot programme, the proposals to be funded under the pilot programme would be prioritized so that the total number of projects and project formulation grants (PFGs) under the programme maximizes the total diversity of projects/PFGs. This would be done using a three-tier prioritization system: so that the proposals in relatively less funded sectors would be prioritized as the first level of prioritization. If there are more than one proposal in the same sector: the proposals in relatively less funded regions are prioritized as the second level of prioritization. If there are more than one proposal in the same region, the proposals submitted by relatively less represented implementing entity would be prioritized as the third level of prioritization;

(ii) To request the secretariat to report on the progress and experiences of the pilot programme to the PPRC at its twenty-third meeting; and

(b) *With regard to financing regional proposals beyond the pilot programme referred to above:*

(i) *To continue considering regional proposals for funding, within the two categories originally described in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2: ones requesting up to US\$ 14 million, and others requesting up to US\$ 5 million, subject to review of the regional programme;*

(ii) *To establish two pipelines for technically cleared regional proposals: one for proposals up to US\$ 14 million and the other for proposals up to US\$ 5 million, and place any technically cleared regional proposals, in those pipelines, in the order described in decision B.17/19 (their date of recommendation by the PPRC, their submission date, their lower “net” cost); and*

(iii) *To fund projects from the two pipelines, using funds available for the respective types of implementing entities, so that the maximum number of or maximum total funding for projects and project formulation grants to be approved each fiscal year will be outlined at the time of approving the annual work plan of the Board.*

(Decision B.28/1)

18. At its thirty-first meeting, the Board subsequently decided:

(a) *To merge the two pipelines for technically cleared regional proposals established in decision B.28/1(b)(ii), so that starting in fiscal year 2019 the provisional amount of funding for regional proposals would be allocated without distinction between the two categories originally described in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2, and that the funding of regional proposals would be established on a ‘first come, first served’ basis; and*

(b) *To include in its work programme for fiscal year 2019 provision of an amount of US\$ 60 million for the funding of regional project and programme proposals, as follows:*

(i) *Up to US\$ 59 million to be used for funding regional project and programme proposals in the two categories of regional projects and programmes: ones requesting up to US\$ 14 million, and others requesting up to US\$ 5 million; and*

(ii) *Up to US\$ 1 million for funding project formulation grant requests for preparing regional project and programme concepts or fully-developed project and programme documents.*

(Decision B.31/3)

19. At the thirty-third meeting of the Board, *having considered the recommendation of the PPRC, the Adaptation Fund Board decided 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:*

(a) *Up to US\$ 59 million for the funding of regional project and programme proposals; and*

(b) 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)

20. As of the date of this report, the amount of funding that had been provisionally set aside via Decision B.33/12 has been exhausted, and there is one waitlisted project, as per Decision B.35.a-35.b/25. If the PPRC should recommend the approval of any of the regional projects considered during this review cycle, the Board may wish to decide to place them on the waitlist as described in decisions B.28/1 and B.31/3, until such time that the Board decides to make available additional funding for regional projects and programmes.

21. At the twenty-fifth Board meeting, the secretariat had proposed that the Board 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)

22. As previously mentioned, the proposals being currently considered include a number of proposals that had been reviewed to be considered in a regular Board meeting that was supposed to take place from March 31-April 3, and to the Board meeting that was supposed to take place from 23-26 June 2020 that were subsequently determined to be ineligible for normal intersessional processing due to being first-time submissions. They are presented to be considered in line with the decision B.35.a-35.b/39 on the *Ad Interim* intersessional review process. Specifically, eight first-

time submissions, of which seven were single-country proposals, could not be finalized in accordance with the intersessional process. Out of the seven country proposals, two were for fully-developed projects. There was also one first-time submission of a regional proposal that was a concept.

23. In addition to those projects, 15 proposals for other projects were submitted in advance of the June meeting that also did not take place ultimately, making a total of 23 projects that are presented here-below.

Project/programme proposals submitted by implementing entities: single-country proposals

24. Accredited implementing entities submitted 17 eligible single-country project proposals to the secretariat, with the total requested funding amounting to US\$ 91,209,719. The proposals included US\$ 6,627,227 or 7.8%² in Implementing Entities management fees and US\$ 5,214,928 or 7.71%³ in execution costs.

25. Of the 17 projects, 11 are fully-developed project proposals. They were submitted by National and Multilateral Implementing Entities of the Fund; the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan), National Environment Management Council (NEMC), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and World Food Programme (WFP).

26. Two out of the 17 proposals are for small projects, i.e. they request funding not exceeding US\$ 1,000,000. Both proposals were submitted by Kemitraan.

27. The proposals do not request management fees in excess of 8.5% and are thus in compliance with Board Decision B.11/16. In accordance with the same Decision B.11/16, all proponents of fully-developed project documents provide a budget on fee use.

28. All proposals are in compliance with Board Decision B.13/17 to cap execution costs at 9.5% of the project/programme budget.

29. All proposals request funding below the cap of US\$10 million decided on a temporary basis, for each country, as per Decision B.13/23.

30. All of the fully-developed project/programme documents provide an explanation and a breakdown of their execution costs and other administrative costs, and are in compliance with the following Board Decision made in the twelfth meeting:

(b) To request to the implementing entities that the project document include an explanation and a breakdown of all administrative costs associated with the project, including the execution costs.

(Decision B.12/7)

² The implementing entity management fee percentage is calculated compared to the project budget including the project activities and the execution costs, before the management fee.

³ The execution costs percentage is calculated as a percentage of the project budget, including the project activities and the execution costs, before the implementing entity management fee.

31. Details of the single-country proposals are contained in the separate PPRC working documents, as follows:

1. Full Proposals: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number
NIE			
	Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/23
	Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/24
	Indonesia (3)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/25
	Indonesia (4)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/26
	Tanzania, United Republic of (1)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/27
	Tanzania, United Republic of (2)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/28
MIE			
	Cambodia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/29
	Cameroon	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/30
	Egypt	WFP	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/37
	Liberia	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/38
	Zimbabwe	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/31
2. Concepts: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number
NIE			
	Bhutan	BTFEC	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/44
	Uganda	MOWE	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/41
	Zimbabwe	EMA	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/42
MIE			
	Haiti	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/39
	Malaysia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/43
	Syria Arab Republic	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/40

Project/programme proposals submitted by implementing entities: regional proposals

32. Accredited MIEs submitted to the secretariat six eligible proposals for regional projects and programmes. The total requested funding of those proposals amounted to US\$ 74,471,372. Two of the proposals were fully-developed projects. The total requested funding for the fully-developed regional proposals included \$1,643,087 or 8.5% in Implementing Entities' management fees and US\$ 1,836,113 or 9.5% in execution costs.

33. The proposals were submitted by three MIEs: IFAD, UN-Habitat and UNEP. Details of the regional proposals are contained in the separate PPRC working documents, as follows:

4. Full Proposals: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number
MIE			
	Jordan, Lebanon	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/32
	Thailand, Viet Nam	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/33
5. Concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number
RIE			
	Angola, Namibia	OSS	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/34
	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo	OSS	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/35
MIE			
	Antigua and Barbuda, and St Lucia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/36
	Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/45

The review process

34. In accordance with the operational policies and guidelines, the secretariat screened and prepared technical reviews of the 23 project and programme proposals.

35. In line with the Board request at its tenth meeting, the secretariat shared the initial technical review findings with the Implementing Entities that had submitted the proposals and solicited their responses to specific items requiring clarification. Responses were requested by e-mail, and the time allowed for the Implementing Entities to respond was one week. The Implementing Entities were offered the opportunity to discuss the initial review findings with the secretariat by telephone as is the usual practice.

36. The secretariat subsequently reviewed the IEs' responses to the clarification requests, and compiled comments and recommendations that are presented in the addendum to this document (AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/22/Add.1).

Issues identified during the review process

Issues related to the Multilateral Implementing Entity cap

37. As mentioned above, based on the latest Financial Report prepared by the Trustee (as of 30 June 2020), and excluding certain projects as necessary, the funds available for projects submitted by MIEs below the 50% cap amounted to US\$ 32.19 million.

38. In addition, the funding that had been provisionally set aside via decision B.33/12, for regional projects and programmes in fiscal year 2020, has been exhausted, and the Board has not,

as of the date of this report, made a new decision on a new provisional set aside for fiscal year 2021. Therefore, in accordance with decisions B.28/1, B.31/3 and B.33/12, the PPRC may want to recommend the Board to place any regional projects or programmes that are considered technically cleared for approval, in a waitlist, and that decisions on the approval of those projects or programmes would be made at such a time that the Board decides to make available additional funding for regional projects and programmes. The funding of regional projects and programmes is linked to the funds available for the respective types of implementing entities (Decision B.28/1).

39. Accordingly, four single country proposals and three regional proposals to be implemented by MIEs and submitted for consideration at the thirty-fifth and the second part of the thirty-fifth meeting, are to be placed in a waitlist. They will be subject to availability of resources and respecting the 50 per cent cap set for projects and programmes submitted by MIEs, and the provisional set-aside for regional projects and programmes.

Issues related to accreditation status of the implementing entities

40. All proposals were submitted and subsequently their technical reviews were completed while the submitting IEs were accredited. However, more recently, the status of the two of the IEs has changed to “under re-accreditation” in the meantime before the date the project and programme review committee (PPRC) will finalize its recommendation for Adaptation Fund Board consideration. This was a result of the fact the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board could not take place in a regular manner, due to the developments related to the global pandemic of COVID-19, as well as the subsequent delays and the postponement of the June session as well.

41. As a result, the proposals whose IE is falling under the category “under re-accreditation” and are recommended for approval, may also be placed in a waitlist, with the understanding that the project cannot be considered for funding approval by the Board if the status of the IE is other than “accredited” at that time. Once the requisite funding become available for the projects on the waitlist, they would be recommended for approval in the order in which they have been listed. However, only those projects that have been proposed by IEs that are in category “accredited” when requisite funds are available, would be recommended, as shall be confirmed by the decision of the Board. Waitlisted projects or programmes that have been proposed by IEs that are in category “under re-accreditation”, could remain on the waitlist until such time that they are moved to category “accredited”, at which time, if the requisite funding is available, such project(s) or programme(s) would be forwarded to the Board with a recommendation to approve the project(s) or programme(s), pending availability of funding. Should the funding become available while the status of the IE becomes or continues to be “under re-accreditation”, the next eligible project on the list could be considered. If the IE with waitlisted project(s) or programme(s) is moved to category “not accredited”, their project(s) or programme(s) would be removed from the waitlist.

Waitlisting of projects

42. Considering that neither in March-April or June 2020, due to the developments related to the global pandemic of COVID-19, the thirty-fifth and the second part of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board could take place in a regular manner, and given that all the prioritization criteria are the same for MIE cap or for regional projects, as set by Decisions B.17/19, B.19/5 and B.28/1, and which have been used previously for waitlisting projects, it is suggested that the projects and programmes which are subject to either the MIE cap or the regional programming cap or both be prioritized according to the criteria and potentially placed into a single waitlist via a decision that would determine the order in which they would be considered for the funding by the Board. The Board may then wish to consider the approval of the individual projects on the waitlist at the time

the requisite funding under the relevant cap or caps becomes available, based on the order on the waitlist and availability of funding under respective caps, subject to the IE's eligibility based on accreditation status.

43. Recalling Decision B.17/19, at its seventeenth meeting the Board decided to:

[..]

(c) Prioritize the projects/programmes in the pipeline by sequentially applying the following criteria:

(i) Their date of recommendation by the PPRC;

(ii) Their submission date; and

(iii) The lower "net" cost.

(Decision B.17/19)

44. At the nineteenth meeting, having considered the comments and recommendations of the Projects and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to define the submission date referred to in paragraph (b) of Decision B.17/19 as the date of the submission of the fully developed project/programme document to the particular meeting in which it was recommended for approval by the Project and Programme Review Committee (Decision B.19/5).

45. Further, at its thirty-third meeting, the Board, having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, decided 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).

46. The below table shows the pipeline of waitlisted projects and programmes, whose prioritization has been defined according to the afore mentioned Board Decisions (Decisions B.17/19, B.19/5, B.28/1 and B.33/11).

AFB.35.a-35.b Provisional Full Waitlist – MIE and Regional Project

Projects/programmes in the pipeline recommended to be placed in the pipeline for single country and regional projects/programmes								
	Country	Recommendation date - d/m/y (Criterion 1)	Submission date - d/m/y (Criterion 2)	Net cost, US\$ M (Criterion 3)	Request, US\$ M	Subject to MIE cap (Y/N)	Subject to reg. cap (Y/N)	Accreditation status
1	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan (UNESCO)	8/5/2020	20/01/2020	6,018,519	6,500,000	Y	Y	Accredited
2	Egypt (WFP)	<i>Not yet recommended by PPRC</i>	20/01/2020	2,852,500	3,094,962	Y	N	Accredited
3	Cambodia (UN-Habitat)*	<i>Not yet recommended by PPRC</i>	20/04/2020	4,608,295	5,000,000	Y	N	In re-accr. process
4	Thailand, Viet Nam (UNEP)*	<i>Not yet recommended by PPRC</i>	20/04/2020	6,451,612	7,000,000	Y	Y	In re-accr. process
5	Liberia (IFAD)	<i>Not yet recommended by PPRC</i>	20/04/2020	8,840,629	9,592,082	Y	N	Accredited
6	Cameroon (IFAD)	<i>Not yet recommended by PPRC</i>	20/04/2020	9,200,000	9,982,000	Y	N	Accredited
7	Jordan, Lebanon (UN-Habitat)*	<i>Not yet recommended by PPRC</i>	20/04/2020	12,878,810	13,973,509	Y	Y	In re-accr. process

*Accreditation probably not renewed before the next PPRC meeting currently planned during week of Aug. 24

Recommendation

47. The PPRC may wish to consider recommending that the Board, recalling decisions B. 17/9, B.19/5 and B.28/1/ that established waitlists for projects and programmes submitted by multilateral implementing entities (MIEs) and for regional projects and programmes, respectively, for which funding was not readily available from the resources in the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund, decide to:

- a) Merge the two pipelines for the single country and regional waitlisted projects and programmes, maintaining the application of the criteria set forth in Decisions B.17/19, B.19/5 and B.28/1 concerning prioritization; and
- b) Place any proposal for a concrete adaptation project or programme, technically cleared by the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), that has been submitted by an implementing entity whose accreditation status, as described in document AFB/B.34/5, was “accredited” at the time of submission but whose status has become “in re-accreditation process” by the time the PPRC finalizes its review of the proposal, on the waitlist mentioned under subparagraph (a) above, with the understanding that funding, once available, can only be provided to those entities that are eligible to receive it; and
- c) Consider approving funding for the proposals contained in the combined waitlist described in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above when funding becomes available for those proposals, taking into account their order in the waitlist, the funding allocation limits approved by the Board for projects and programmes submitted by multilateral implementing entities and for regional projects and programmes, and the proponent’s accreditation status.

Table: Project proposals submitted to the intersessional review cycle between the 35.a and 35.b Adaptation Fund Board meetings

1. Full Proposals: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
NIE								
	Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/23	963,456	75,478	8.50%	84,358	9.50%
	Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/24	1,125,015	88,134	8.50%	98,503	9.50%
	Indonesia (3)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/25	710,000		0.00%	85,000	11.97%
	Indonesia (4)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/26	5,972,670	88,266	1.50%	559,018	9.49%
	Tanzania, United Republic of (1)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/27	1,400,000	107,000	8.28%	120,000	9.28%
	Tanzania, United Republic of (2)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/28	1,280,000	92,203	7.76%	103,051	8.68%
MIE								
	Cambodia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.26.a- 26.b/29	5,000,000	391,705	8.50%	437,700	9.50%
	Cameroon	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.26.a- 26.b/30	9,982,000	782,000	8.50%	500,000	5.43%
	Egypt	WFP	AFB/PPRC.26.a- 26.b/37	3,094,962	242,462	8.50%	246,900	8.66%
	Liberia	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.26.a- 26.b/38	9,592,082	751,453	8.33%	372,594	1.96%
	Zimbabwe	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.26.a- 26.b/31	5,000,000	391,692	8.50%	437,789	9.50%
	Sub-total, USD			44,120,185	3,010,393	6.99%	2,485,895	8.50%
2. Concepts: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
NIE								
	Bhutan	BT FEC	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/44	9,950,535	779,535	8.50%	600,000	6.54%
	Uganda	MOWE	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/41	2,249,000	173,786	8.37%	30,668	1.48%
	Zimbabwe	EMA	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/42	5,000,000	391,692	8.50%	437,789	9.50%
MIE								
	Haiti	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.26.a- 26.b/39	9,890,000	705,000	7.68%	785,000	8.55%
	Malaysia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/43	10,000,000	783,410	8.50%	875,576	9.50%
	Syria Arab Republic	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/40	10,000,000	783,410	8.50%	875,900	9.50%
	Sub-total, USD			47,089,535	\$3,616,833	8%	\$2,729,033	7.71%

3. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) / Project Formulation Assistance (PFA):	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD
NIE				
PFG	Bhutan	BTFEC	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/44/Add.1	30,000
PFA	Bhutan	BTFEC	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/44/Add.2	20,000
PFG	Uganda	MOWE	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/41/Add.1	27,000
PFA	Uganda	MOWE	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/41/Add.2	20,000
PFG	Zimbabwe	EMA	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/42/Add.1	30,000
PFA	Zimbabwe	EMA	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/42/Add.2	20,000
Sub-total, USD				147,000

4. Full Proposals: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
MIE								
	Jordan, Lebanon	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/32	13,973,509	1,094,699	8.50%	1,223,210	9.50%
	Thailand, Viet Nam	UNEP	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/33	7,000,000	548,388	8.50%	612,903	9.50%
Sub-total, USD				20,973,509	1,643,087	8.50%	1,836,113	9.50%
5. Concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
RIE								
	Angola, Namibia	OSS	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/34	11,835,000	930,000	8.53%	1,005,000	9.22%
	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo	OSS	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/35	14,000,000	1,070,363	8.28%	1,093,270	8.46%
MIE								
	Antigua and Barbuda, and St Lucia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/36	13,662,863	1,070,363	8.50%	1,106,730	8.79%
	Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/45	14,000,000	980,000		826,770	6.35%
Sub-total, USD				41,662,863	3,120,726	8.39%	3,026,770	7.86%

6. Project Formulation Grants: Regional Concepts	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD
RIE				
	Angola, Namibia	OSS	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/34/Add.1	80,000
	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo	OSS	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/35/Add.1	80,000
MIE				
	Antigua and Barbuda, and St Lucia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/36/Add.1	80,000
	Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/45/Add.1	100,000
Sub-total, USD				260,000