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RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PROJECT AND PROGRAMME
REVIEW COMMITTEE ON PROPOSALS CONSIDERED DURING
THE INTERSESSIONAL AD INTERIM 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)

3. In the intersessional period between the first and second sessions of the thirty-fifth meeting, the Board 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, a) took note of the fact that such proposals that were submitted to be considered at 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 subsequently decided to:

(a) Organize an Ad Interim Review Process, as described in document AFB/B.35.a-35.b/15, 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;

(b) 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

(c) 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)
Project/programme proposals submitted by implementing entities

4. The PPRC considered, during the intersessional period between the first and second sessions of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Board, in the second review cycle and Ad Interim review intersessional review cycle, seventeen single-country project proposals and six regional project proposals, as well as the report of the secretariat on the initial screening and technical review, contained in the following documents (Table 1):

Table 1: List of project proposals under consideration for the second intersessional and Ad Interim review cycles between the first and second sessions of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPRC Document Number</th>
<th>Document Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/23</td>
<td>Proposal for Indonesia (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/24</td>
<td>Proposal for Indonesia (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/26</td>
<td>Proposal for Indonesia (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/28</td>
<td>Proposal for Tanzania (United Republic of) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/29</td>
<td>Proposal for Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/30</td>
<td>Proposal for Cameroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/31</td>
<td>Proposal for Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/33</td>
<td>Proposal for Thailand, Viet Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/34</td>
<td>Proposal for Angola, Namibia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/36</td>
<td>Proposal for Antigua and Barbuda, and Saint Lucia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: List of project proposals under consideration for the Ad Interim review cycle between the first and second sessions of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPRC Document Number</th>
<th>Document Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/37</td>
<td>Proposal for Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/41</td>
<td>Proposal for Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/42</td>
<td>Proposal for Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/43</td>
<td>Proposal for Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/44</td>
<td>Proposal for Bhutan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Further, the PPRC considered three small grants for innovation and one learning grant, as well as the report of the secretariat on the initial screening and technical review of the small grants proposals for innovation and the small grant proposal for learning, contained in the following documents (Table 3):

**Table 3: List of small grants for innovation and of small grants proposals for learning considered in the *Ad Interim* intersessional review cycle between the first and second sessions of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPRC Document Number</th>
<th>Document Title (small grants for innovation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/47</td>
<td>Proposal for Antigua and Barbuda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPRC Document Number</th>
<th>Document Title (small grant for learning)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/51</td>
<td>Proposal for Senegal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The summary information on the proposals is contained in the Table 4 and 5 below.
Table 4: Detailed list of Project proposals considered in the second intersessional review cycle and *Ad Interim* review cycle between the first and second sessions of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board

<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>Indonesia (1)</td>
<td>Kemitraan</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/23</td>
<td>963,456</td>
<td>75,478</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>84,358</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td>Indonesia (2)</td>
<td>Kemitraan</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/24</td>
<td>1,125,015</td>
<td>88,135</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>98,503</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td>Indonesia (3)</td>
<td>Kemitraan</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/25</td>
<td>820,444</td>
<td>64,274</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>71,836</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td>Indonesia (4)</td>
<td>Kemitraan</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/26</td>
<td>5,972,670</td>
<td>88,266</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>559,018</td>
<td>9.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania (1)</td>
<td>NEMC</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/27</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>9.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania (3)</td>
<td>NEMC</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/28</td>
<td>1,280,000</td>
<td>92,203</td>
<td>7.76%</td>
<td>103,051</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/29</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>391,705</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>437,700</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/30</td>
<td>9,982,000</td>
<td>782,000</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/37</td>
<td>3,094,962</td>
<td>242,462</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>246,900</td>
<td>8.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/38</td>
<td>9,592,082</td>
<td>751,453</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>372,594</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/31</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>391,692</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>437,789</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>44,230,629</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,074,668</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,472,731</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Concepts: Single-country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Bhutan</td>
<td>BTFEC</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/44</td>
<td>9,950,535</td>
<td>779,535</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>6.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>MOWE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/41</td>
<td>2,249,000</td>
<td>173,786</td>
<td>8.37%</td>
<td>30,668</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/42</td>
<td>4,989,915</td>
<td>390,915</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>399,000</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MIE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Haiti</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/39</td>
<td>9,890,000</td>
<td>705,000</td>
<td>7.68%</td>
<td>785,000</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/43</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>783,410</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>875,576</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria Arab Republic</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/40</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>783,410</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>875,900</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total, USD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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></td>
<td>47,079,450</td>
<td>3,616,056</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,566,144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) / Project Formulation Assistance (PFA): Single-country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Bhutan</td>
<td>BTFEC</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/44/Add.1</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>BTFEC</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/44/Add.2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>MOWE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/41/Add.1</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>MOWE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/41/Add.2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/42/Add.1</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/42/Add.2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total, USD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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></td>
<td>147,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Full Proposals: Regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Countries</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><strong>MIE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan, Lebanon</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/32</td>
<td>13,973,509</td>
<td>1,094,699</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>1,223,210</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand, Viet Nam</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/33</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>548,388</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>612,903</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,973,509</td>
<td>1,643,087</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,836,113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Concepts: Regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Countries</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><strong>RIE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo</td>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/35</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>1,093,270</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
<td>1,107,730</td>
<td>8.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola, Namibia</td>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/34</td>
<td>11,880,000</td>
<td>930,000</td>
<td>8.49%</td>
<td>1,005,000</td>
<td>9.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53,542,863</td>
<td>4,073,633</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,032,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Countries</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>Antigua and Barbuda, and St Lucia</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/36</td>
<td>13,662,863</td>
<td>1,070,363</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>1,092,500</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/45</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>980,000</td>
<td>826,770</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 5: Innovation small grant proposals and learning small grant proposal submitted to the intersessional review cycle between the first and second session of the thirty-fifth Board meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Countries</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><strong>RIE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo</td>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/35/Add.1</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola, Namibia</td>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/34/Add.1</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda, and St Lucia</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/36/Add.1</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/45/Add.1</td>
<td>100,000</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>340,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL (1+2+3+4+5+6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>166,313,451</strong> <strong>12,407,444</strong> <strong>11,906,988</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>IE</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><strong>NIE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/47</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td>2,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>IDDI</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/48</td>
<td>249,929</td>
<td>19,580</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>3,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>MOWE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/49</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Learning Grants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NIE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/51</td>
<td>144,848</td>
<td>11,348</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL (1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

Report of the Secretariat to the Project and Programme Review Committee

7. The PPRC decided to recommend 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 merged 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.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/19)

Single-country projects and programmes

Fully-developed proposals

Proposals from National Implementing Entities (NIEs)

Small-size proposals:

Indonesia: Enhancing the Adaptation Capability of Coastal Community in Facing the Impacts of Climate Change in Negeri (Village) Asilulu, Ureng and Lima of Leihitu District Maluku Tengah Regency Maluku Province (Fully-developed project; Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan); IDN/NIE/CZM/2019/1; US$ 963,456).

8. The objective of the proposed project is to support climate change adaptation actions and its implementation in Maluku Province as established in Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation Road Map and Sustainable Development of Maluku Province. The project aims to improve the level
of adaptability and resilience, as well as to eliminate vulnerability in the social, economic and ecological standpoint from the threat of climate change experienced by coastal communities in three Negeri (Villages) by utilizing sustainability principles in managing and leveraging coastal ecosystem region. The project aims to achieve its objectives through four components:

a) Component 1: Mapping of fishing grounds which is integrated with traditional knowledge of the local fishermen;

b) Component 2: Restoration of shallow sea ecosystem for the fishermen’ resilience and alternative fishing grounds;

c) Component 3: Development of alternative economic sources in the coastal areas which are resilient to the climate by improving the fishery and marine technology;

d) Component 4: Development of supporting facilities to anticipate the impacts of coastal flooding and tidal waves, as well as supporting facilities to improve the sale value of the fishermen’ catch.

9. This is the second submission of the fully developed project proposal, using a two-step approach.

10. The initial review found that the proposed needed to make a number of improvements with respect to more clearly describing activities, especially their long-term sustainability and their cost-effectiveness. It also needed to demonstrate compliance with the AF Environmental Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy (GP). The IE also need to round up all financing totals (project components, IE fees and EE costs breakdowns) avoiding the utilization of decimal points. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

11. The final technical review finds that the project needs to further clarify the sustainability of few activities. The proposal needs to better demonstrate compliance with the AF ESP and GP and submit all relevant assessments. Finally, the IE needs to ensure that the project document does not include decimals in the IE fees, EE costs and Total Financing Requested amount in relevant tables and the cover page.

12. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

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

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

   (i) The proposal should clarify how the project will ensure sustainability of concrete interventions after the project ends;

   (ii) The proposal needs to submit a Gender Assessment and, clarify how the outcomes of assessment enabled the determination of the differentiated
needs, capabilities, roles and knowledge resources and how proposed actions might drive lasting positive social impacts;

(iii) The proposal should provide an overview of environmental and social impacts / risks identified, in compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund;

(iv) The proposal should include whole numbers, avoiding decimals in all relevant financing tables throughout the document.

c) Request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Indonesia.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/20)

Indonesia: EMBRACING THE SUN: Redefining Public Space as a Solution for the Effects of Global Climate Change in Indonesia’s Urban Areas (Fully-developed project; Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan); IDN/NIE/Urban/2019/1; US$ 820,444).

13. The objective of the proposed project is to design climate-resilient urban public spaces as to enable community resilience in Samarinda City, Indonesia. This will be done through the four components below:

a) Component 1: Research and Development on citywide adaptation to climate change through public spaces;

b) Component 2: Awareness raising and local resilience strengthening through the design and implementation of a new public space typology;

c) Component 3: Capacity building, knowledge management and communication;

d) Component 4: Monitoring.

14. This is the third submission of the fully-developed project document, using a two-step approach.

15. The initial review found that the project needed to: (1) address concerns regarding the overall project design and the adaptation benefits to be realized, and (2) the overall compliance with the AFs ESP and GP. Several clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

16. The final technical review found that the project needed to: (1) present a stronger rational for adaptation interventions, (2) provide examples of planned infrastructure measures consistent with the AF’s results framework, (3) ensure fees are provided in line with AF requirements, and (4) improve sustainability aspects and provide a gender assessment. Several clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.
17. The final technical review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have not been adequately addressed. It was suggested that the project proponents revert back to initial concerns raised in the initial review and update the proposal accordingly.

18. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

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

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

      (i) The proposal should further elaborate the linkages and synergies with all the relevant projects, including areas of overlap and complementarity.

   c) Request Kemitraan to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Indonesia.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/21)

Regular proposals:

Indonesia: Adapting to Climate Change through Sustainable Integrated Watershed Governance in Indigenous People of Ammatoa Kajang Customary Area in Bulukumba Regency, South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia (Fully-developed project; Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan); IDN/NIE/Water/2019/1; US$ 1,125,015).

19. The objective of the proposed project is to enhance climate resilience and build adaptive capacity toward climate change for vulnerable communities through sustainable integrated watershed governance. The project aims to overcome a decline in the ecological capacity of the watershed due to climate change, which is leading to loss of agriculture-based livelihoods. The project aims to achieve this through the following four components:

   a) Component 1: Developing model of sustainable integrated watershed management inside the Indigenous People of Ammatoa Kajang customary area (Apparang, Baontoa and Raowa Watershed).

   b) Component 2: Promoting and practicing sustainable livelihood adaptive to climate change at the three watershed landscapes in the Indigenous People of Ammatoa Kajang customary area.

   c) Component 3: Lobbying and Policy Advocacy for climate adaptive sustainable integrated watershed management and Climate Adaptation Action plan to regency government of Bulukumba and South Sulawesi Provincial government.
d) Component 4: Raising awareness, knowledge, management and disseminating information on the importance of watershed and climate change impact to the Indigenous People of Ammatoa Kajang customary area.

20. This is the second submission of the fully-developed project document, using a two-step approach.

21. The initial review found that the project needed to address issues relating to a lack of information on beneficiaries and concerns about environmental and social risks, including human rights issues. Some clarification requests (CR) and corrective actions requests (CAR) were made.

22. The final technical review finds that the CRs and CARs raised during the initial technical review have been adequately addressed.

23. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Approve the fully-developed project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan) to the request made by the technical review;

   b) Approve the funding of US$ 1,125,015 for the implementation of the project, as requested by Kemitraan; and

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

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/22)

Indonesia: Safekeeping-Surviving-Sustaining towards Resilience: 3S Approach to Build 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$ 5,972,670).

24. The objective of the proposed project is to build resilience to climate change impacts in Pekalongan City (Indonesia) by implementing hard and soft adaptation interventions in vulnerable coastal communities. This will be done through the five components below:

   a) Component 1: Enhancing protection along the coastal line of Pekalongan City;

   b) Component 2: Climate Change Adaptation Action Plan (RAD API), climate change information system, Climate Smart Initiative;

   c) Component 3: 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) **Component 4**: 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;

e) **Component 5**: Improving community’s resilience through initiation of alternative livelihood and improvement of sanitation facility.

25. This is the fifth submission of the fully-developed project document, using a two-step approach.

26. The initial review found that the project needed to provide a detailed budget and accompanying budget notes and ensure that sex-disaggregated indicators are noted in the M&E framework. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

27. The final technical review finds that CR and CAR raised in the initial review have been addressed.

28. The PPRC decided to **recommend** to the Board to:

   a) Approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided the Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia (Kemitraan), to the request made by the technical review;

   b) Approve the funding of US$ 5,972,670 for the implementation of the project, as requested by Kemitraan and;

   c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with Kemitraan as the national implementing entity for the project

   *(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/23)*

**United Republic of Tanzania: Bunda Climate Resilience and Adaptation Project** *(Fully-developed project; National Environment Management Council (NEMC); TZA/NIE/Agric/2019/1; US$ 1,400,000).*

29. The objective of the proposed project is to enhance resilience and adaptive capacity to the effects of climate change, while reducing the vulnerability of selected communities in Bunda District. In the project area, communities are vulnerable to the effects of climate change which is leading to significant water deficits and drought-induced food shortages. The project aims to achieve its objective through the following five components:

a) **Component 1**: Enhancing Climate resilience for improved access to rural water supply system in selected drought prone agro-pastoral communities of Bunda district;

b) **Component 2**: Improving agricultural productivity, livelihood and agro-ecosystem resilience through Climate Smart EVA practices);
c) **Component 3**: Promoting paradigm change of small-scale fishers for sustainable income and climate resilient rural livelihood through aquaculture innovations in selected villages of Bunda district;

d) **Component 4**: Improve ecological and environmental services and functions to sustain climate sensitive rural livelihoods in selected rural communities of Bunda District;

e) **Component 5**: Strengthening institutional capacity and knowledge management on climate change adaptation.

30. This is the first submission of the fully-developed project document, using a two-step approach.

31. The initial review found that the project needed to address a number of issues, including a lack of information on climate-resilient water supply infrastructures and concerns about managing and monitoring environmental and social risks. Some clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

32. The final technical review finds that the CRs and CARs raised during the initial technical review have not been adequately addressed. Significant concerns remain on the lack of detail on infrastructural design and the adequacy of the proposed infrastructure to provide water supply to rural populations in the medium to long term.

33. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Not approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) to the request made by the technical review;

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

      i) The proposal should provide further specific information on the extent and scale of climate-resilient water supply infrastructures, and how water supply infrastructures are designed to withstand negative climate change impacts;

      ii) The proponent should ensure that the Results Framework includes all relevant gender-sensitive targets and indicators that will be monitored and evaluated during and after project implementation.

   c) Request the NEMC to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania.

*(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/24)*
United Republic of Tanzania: Strategic Water Harvesting Technologies for Enhancing Resilience to Climate Change in Rural Communities in Semi-Arid Areas of Tanzania (SWAHAT) (Fully-developed project; National Environment Management Council (NEMC) TZA/NIE/Water/2019/1; US$1,280,000).

34. The objective of the proposed project is to enhance resilience and adaptation of rural communities to climate change-induced impacts of drought, floods, and high temperatures in semi-arid regions in Tanzania. This will be done through the following components listed below:

   a) **Component 1**: Installation and rehabilitation of community water harvesting facilities that will integrate agriculture, livestock, tree planting and aquaculture;

   b) **Component 2**: Develop and implement participatory afforestation program for locally adapted fruit and forest;

   c) **Component 3**: Develop integrated climate resilient livelihoods diversification through improved technologies in agriculture;

   d) **Component 4**: Formulate and implement interventions for integrated management of emerging climate change related pests and diseases that affect crops and livestock productivity;

   e) **Component 5**: Knowledge Management: Increased capacity of vulnerable semi-arid communities in adaptation to impacts of climate change through adoption of various technologies from SWAHAT project.

35. This is the first submission of the fully developed project document, using a one-step approach.

36. The initial review from the first review cycle of the intercessional meeting found that the project needed to: include more details regarding how the project would ensure the representation of vulnerable groups, including people living with HIV/AIDS and the elderly, and their participation in the project. More details were also needed on the names of the women’s groups involved in the consultations process. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

37. The final technical review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the first review cycle of the intersessional meeting have been adequately addressed. It would be useful to have more information on the communications approaches, activities, and tools mentioned in the gender-responsive approach, however, further clarifications on these few specific items could be supplied after project approval.

38. The PPRC decided to **recommend** to the Board to:

   a) Approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) to the request made by the technical review;

   b) Approve the funding of US$ 1,280,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by NEMC; and
c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with NEMC as the national implementing entity for the project. The agreement should include a commitment from NEMC that, prior to first disbursement, NEMC will submit more information on the communications approaches, activities, and tools mentioned in the gender-responsive approach, as outlined in the technical review.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/25)

Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)

Regular proposals

Cambodia: Climate change adaptation through protective small-scale infrastructure interventions in coastal settlements of Cambodia (Fully-developed project; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); KHM/MIE/Urban/2017/1; US$ 5,000,000).

This proposal was received, and its review completed while the Implementing Entity was accredited. It is currently in the status of “under re-accreditation”. Furthermore, this fully-developed proposal may be placed in the waitlist, subject to availability of resources under the MIE cap.

39. The objective of the proposed project is to enhance climate change adaptation and resilience of the most vulnerable coastal human settlements of Cambodia through concrete adaptation actions, particularly in areas where eco-tourism has the potential to sustain such interventions. This will be done through the three components below:

a) Component 1: Enhancing community-scale knowledge and capacity to sustain the adaptation benefits of the project’s investments;

b) Component 2: Enhancing government planning and technical capacity, and capturing and disseminating knowledge to sustain and enhance the project’s adaptation benefits;

c) Component 3: Building resilience through investment in small-scale protective and basic service infrastructure and natural assets.

40. This is the second submission of the fully developed project document, using a two-step approach.

41. The initial review found that the project needed to: conduct a gender assessment in line with the AF’s Gender Policy and adjust the Execution Cost. A few corrective actions requests (CAR) were made.

42. The final technical review finds that the CAR raised during the initial technical review have been adequately addressed.

43. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

a) Note the recommendation that the Adaptation Fund Board:
(i) Approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), to the request made by the technical review;

(ii) Approve the funding of US$ 5,000,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by UN-Habitat; and

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

b) Place the project on the waitlist pursuant to Decisions B.17/19, B.19/5 and B.28/1, with the understanding that funding, once available can only be approved if UN-Habitat has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/26)

Cameroon: Increasing Local Communities’ Resilience to Climate Change through Youth Entrepreneurship and Integrated Natural Resources Management (Fully-developed project; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); CAM/MIE/Rural/2018/1; US$ 9,982,000).

This fully-developed proposal may be placed in the waitlist, subject to availability of resources under the MIE cap.

44. The objective of the proposed project is to increase local communities’ resilience to climate change through resilient livelihoods and integrated natural resources management in the outskirts of the Waza, Benoué and Kimbi-Fungom national parks. To achieve this objective, the project aims to create an enabling environment for climate change adaptation at the institutional level and will contribute to increasing the resilience of both the local ecosystems and natural resources, and local communities to ensure sustainable development the target areas in a changing climate context. The project is structured around three components:

a) **Component 1**: Mainstream climate change adaptation into institutional and regulatory frameworks plans for improved land and natural resources management at regional and local level;

b) **Component 2**: Improve knowledge on ecosystems’ vulnerability to climate change and ecosystem-based adaptation and climate smart businesses opportunities;

c) **Component 3**: Adaptation to climate change measures are implemented to increase climate resilience of targeted communities.

45. This is the third submission of the fully-developed project document, using a one-step approach.

46. The initial review found that the project proposal needed to further clarify the non-duplication of activities under component three with the existing IFAD baseline investment projects. The proposal also needed to further justify the cost-effectiveness of its activities, integrate gender targets in the overall results framework and address a minor budget discrepancy.
47. The final technical review finds that the issues raised during the initial technical review have been sufficiently addressed.

48. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made by the technical review;

   b) Approve the funding of US$ 9,982,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by IFAD; and

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

(The Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/27)

The following proposal is being reviewed using the Ad Interim intersessional process.

Egypt: Building Resilient Food Security Systems to Benefit the Southern Egypt Region- Phase 2 (Fully-developed project; World Food Programme (WFP); EGY/MIE/Food/2019/1; US$ 3,094,962).

49. The objective of the proposed project is to help vulnerable smallholder communities to increase their adaptive capacity to climate impacts on their production, and to build institutional capacity for upscaling and suitability. This will be done through the two components below:

   a) Component 1: Enhancing Resilience of Southern Egypt Communities;

   b) Component 2: Institutional capacity building for replication.

50. This is the first submission of the fully-developed project document, using a one-step approach. It was first submitted as a concept in time for the thirty-fourth board meeting but was withdrawn before PPCR could consider it. In developing the current project proposal, the proponents took on board the comments provided by the secretariat on the concept note which explains the rather low number of CRs.

51. The initial review found that the project needed to provide improved justification, rationale, cost-effectiveness and sustainability of some proposed activities, and needed to revise the ES risk assessment and the management plan. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

52. The final technical review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have been adequately addressed.

53. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:
a) Approve the fully-developed project document, 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$ 3,094,962 for the implementation of the project, as requested by WFP; and

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

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/28)

The following proposal is being reviewed using the Ad Interim intersessional process.

Liberia: Building Climate Resilience in Liberia’s Cocoa and Rice Sectors (Fully developed project; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); LBR/MIE/Agric/2020/1; US$ 9,592,082).

54. The objective of the proposed project is to address key climate vulnerabilities in agriculture and water resources management in the rice and cocoa value chain, and hence contribute to immediate and longer-term development and resilience needs of poor vulnerable smallholder farmers in Liberia. The project aims to achieve its objective through the following components:

   a) Component 1: Climate-proofed agricultural production and post-harvest combined with livelihood diversification;
   b) Component 2: Climate resilient rural transportation and water infrastructure;
   c) Component 3: Institutional capacity building and policy engagement.

55. This is the first submission of the fully developed project document, using a one-step approach.

56. The initial review found that the project needed to: clarify the the adaptation reasoning for some proposed activities; confirm the consultation process during project design and provide justification of the project assessment against the AF ESP and gender policy. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made. In addition, the technical review required a couple of outstanding corrective action to requests (CAR) to be addressed prior to recommendation for board consideration. These relate to project monitoring and evaluation budget (M&E), the adaptation reasoning for some activities under component 2 as well as the cost effectiveness of some activities.

57. The final technical review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have adequately addressed.

58. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made by the technical review;
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b) Approve the funding of US$ US$ 9,592,082 for the implementation of the project, as requested by IFAD; and

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

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/29)

Zimbabwe: Strengthening Local Communities’ Adaptive Capacity and Resilience to Climate Change Through Sustainable Groundwater Exploitation in Zimbabwe (Fully-developed project; The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); ZWE/CIE/Water/2018/1; US$ 5,000,000).

59. The objective of the proposed project is to increase local communities’ adaptive capacity and resilience to climate change. It proposes to achieve this through sustainable groundwater exploitation for food security and other productive uses in rural areas of Zimbabwe, through the following five components:

a) **Component 1**: To strengthen technical, institutional and human capacity at national and local levels for improved and sustainable utilization of groundwater;

b) **Component 2**: To conduct comprehensive assessments of groundwater resources in two poverty-stricken and highly vulnerable sub-catchments of Lower Gwayi and Upper Save and develop sample plans for improving climate resilience through sustainable groundwater utilization;

c) **Component 3**: To strengthen the capacity of water and land management institutions in Lower Gwayi and Upper Save sub-catchments in developing integrated catchment management plans that promote groundwater use and protection of groundwater sources;

d) **Component 4**: To pilot and demonstrate concrete climate change adaptation measures based on sustainable groundwater exploitation by diversifying and strengthening the livelihoods of the most vulnerable population in Lower Gwayi and Upper Save sub-catchments;

e) **Component 5**: To compile and disseminate lessons learnt from the project to facilitate future upscaling and replication of good practices in groundwater extraction and management.

60. This is the third submission of the fully-developed project document, using a two-step approach.

61. The initial review found that the project needed to address a few remaining issues, related to full financing of the students and to provide additional information on compliance with the ESP and GP. A few clarification requests (CR) were made.

62. The final technical review finds that the CR raised during the initial technical review have not been adequately addressed. A substantially modified version of the proposal was submitted, with changes beyond the requested clarifications. The issues related to compliance with the ESP and the GP were only partially addressed.
63. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Not approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to the request made by the technical review;

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

      (i) The proposal should address the issues related to compliance with the ESP and the GP, and in particular in relation to the USPs and the ESMP; and

      (ii) The proposal should better inform its implementation arrangements, providing detailed information on the specific roles and responsibilities of the executing entities.

   c) Request UNESCO to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Zimbabwe.

   (Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/30)

Concept proposals

Proposals from National Implementing Entities (NIEs)

Regular proposals:

The following proposal is being reviewed using the Ad Interim intersessional process.

Bhutan: Adaptation to Climate-induced Water Stresses through Integrated Landscape Management in Bhutan (Concept note; Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation (BTFEC); BTN/NIE/Multi/2020/1; US$9,950,535).

64. The objective of the proposed project is to build resilience to climate change and adaptive capacity of water stressed communities in the dzongkhags (districts) of Paro and Dagana. This will be done through the four (4) components below:

   a) Component 1: Adaptive management of watersheds to enhance climate resilience of communities;

   b) Component 2: Climate resilient water infrastructures for uninterrupted supply of water for drinking and irrigation;

   c) Component 3: Climate-smart agriculture through sustainable land management and informed agro-meteorological services;
d) **Component 4**: Improved local governance for effective CCA mainstreaming with focus on water management at the grassroots.

65. This is the first submission of the concept note using a two-step approach.

66. The initial review found that the project needed to further inform its cost-effectiveness; how it will avoid duplication with other funding sources; and how it will guarantee compliance with the AF’s Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

67. Given the findings of the initial review, which indicated the need for strengthening and furthering preparatory work, the proponent decided to resubmit the proposal at a concept stage and apply for project formulation funding. The final technical review found that, the majority of the issues raised during the initial technical review, pertaining to a concept note level, have been adequately addressed at this stage.

68. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

a) Endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation (BTFEC) to the request made by the technical review;

b) Request the secretariat to notify BTFEC of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues:

   (i) The fully developed project proposal should fully identify project activities and include quantifiable results in line with the environmental and social policy of the fund;

   (ii) A clear description of alternative options to the proposed measures should be provided at fully developed proposal stage, to allow for a good assessment of the project cost effectiveness;

   (iii) The fully developed proposal should include linkages and synergies with all the relevant projects, including areas of overlap and complementarity; and

   (iv) The fully developed proposal environmental and social risk screening should identify all the possible inherent risks and a justification for the screening selection should be provided under each principle.

c) Approve the project formulation grant of US $ 30,000;

d) Approve the project formulation assistance grant of US $ 20,000;

e) Request BTFEC to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Bhutan; and

f) Encourage the Government of Bhutan to submit, through BFTEC, a fully developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph b), above.
The following proposal is being reviewed using the \textit{Ad Interim intersessional process}.  

Uganda: Enhancing Resilience of Communities and Fragile Ecosystems to Climate Change in Katonga Catchment (concept note; Ministry of Water and Environment (MOWE); UGA/NIE/Water/2019/1; US$ 2,249,000).

69. The objective of the proposed project is to strengthen the resilience of communities and fragile ecosystems to climate change impacts through promoting appropriate water infrastructure investments and nature-based solutions. This will be done through the four (4) components below:

   a) \textbf{Component 1}: Strengthen the capacity of key grass root stakeholders for climate change adaptation;

   b) \textbf{Component 2}: Promote appropriate water storage technologies for increased water and food security;

   c) \textbf{Component 3}: Support establishment of nature-based enterprises for improved community livelihoods;

   d) \textbf{Component 4}: Support knowledge management and information sharing.

70. This is the first submission of the concept note using a two-step approach.

71. The initial review found that the project needed to provide further details on the consultations undertaken for the development of this concept note, as it was unclear which specific institutions have been consulted and how their views have been integrated in the proposal. In addition, the environmental and social risk screening needed to be partially revised, to be in compliance with the ESP of the AF. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

72. The final technical review finds that the majority of the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have been adequately addressed.

73. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Endorse the concept note, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Ministry of Water and Environment (MOWE) to the request made by the technical review;

   b) Request the secretariat to notify MOWE of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues:

      (i) The fully-developed project proposal should present a strong climate change adaptation rationale;

      (ii) The fully-developed project proposal elaborate on the cost-effectiveness justification of the chosen interventions;
(iii) The fully-developed proposal should elaborate further the linkages and synergies with all the relevant projects, including areas of overlap and complementarity;

(iv) The fully-developed proposal should elaborate on its long-term sustainability and scalability of the proposed adaptation measures.

c) Approve the project formulation grant of US $ 27,000;

d) Approve the project formulation assistance grant of US $ 20,000;

e) Request MOWE to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Uganda; and

f) Encourage the Government of Uganda to submit, through MOWE, a fully developed project proposal.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/32)

The following proposal is being reviewed using the Ad Interim intersessional process.

Zimbabwe: Enhancing resilience of communities and ecosystems in the face of a changing climate in arid and semi-arid areas of Zimbabwe (Concept note; Environmental Management Agency (EMA); ZWE/NIE/Rural/2020/1; US$ 4,989,915).

74. The objective of the proposed project is to enhance the adaptive capacity of vulnerable communities to effectively engage in sustainable livelihoods in a changing climate. This will be done through the four components below:

a) Component 1: To promote adaptive measures that support sustainable climate smart livelihood;

b) Component 2: To implement measures that support ecosystem resilience;

c) Component 3: Strengthen institutional and governance frameworks to increase socio-ecological resilience to climate change;

d) Component 4: Implement a comprehensive knowledge management system for sharing experiences.

75. This is the first submission of the concept note, using a two-step approach.

76. The initial review found that the project needed to address the issues related to project design, cost-effectiveness, sustainability, adaptation reasoning, and compliance with AF ESP and gender policies. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

77. The final technical review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have been adequately addressed.
78. The PPRC decided to **recommend** to the Board to:

   a) Endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Environmental Management Agency (EMA) to the request made by the technical review;

   b) Request the secretariat to notify EMA of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues:

      (i) The fully-developed project proposal should present a strong climate change adaptation rationale and the selection criteria for the target sites; and

      (ii) The fully-developed proposal should elaborate further the linkages and synergies with all the relevant projects, including areas of overlap and complementarity;

   c) Approve the project formulation grant of US $ 30,000;

   d) Approve the project formulation assistance grant of US $ 20,000;

   e) Request EMA to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Zimbabwe; and

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

   (Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/33)

*Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)*

Regular proposals:

The following proposal is being reviewed using the **Ad Interim intersessional process**.

Haiti: Implementing Measures for Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction Mitigation of School Facilities in Haiti (Concept note; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO); HTI/MIE/DRR/2020/1; US$ 9,890,000).

79. The objective of the proposed project is to enhance the adaptive capacity and resilience of the Haitian education sector to disaster risk of natural hazards related to climate change, through the establishment of a risk assessment tool, school retrofitting and implementing adaptation actions in Haiti. This will be done through the four components below:

   a) **Component 1**: Assessment of school facilities by VISUS methodology;

   b) **Component 2**: Schools adaptation and safety Improvement;
c) **Component 3**: Enhancement of the climate resilience of social community through the educational sector;

d) **Component 4**: Monitoring and Evaluation.

80. This is the first submission of the concept note, using a two-step approach.

81. The initial review found that the project needed to provide better information on how the effect of future climate change on current hazard risk will be considered in the rehabilitation, retrofitting or relocation of school facilities; further, the proposal needed to provide further information regarding the level of engagement of students and communities in the consultations undertaken; and it needed to elaborate more on its financial sustainability; A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

82. The final technical review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have been adequately addressed.

83. The PPRC decided to **recommend** to the Board to:

   a) Endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) to the request made by the technical review;

   b) Request the secretariat to notify UNESCO of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision;

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

   *(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/34)*

The following proposal is being reviewed using the **Ad Interim intersessional process**.

Malaysia: Nature-based climate adaptation programme for the urban areas of Penang island (Concept note; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); MYS/MIE/Urban/2020/21; US$ 10,000,000).

This proposal was received, and its review completed while the Implementing Entity was accredited. It is currently in the status of “under re-accreditation”.

84. The objective of the proposed project is to enhance urban resilience and reduce human and ecosystem health vulnerability to climate change impacts and extreme weather events by implementing nature-based solutions (NBS) to reduce surface temperatures and storm water runoff. The programme also seeks to increase social resilience and build institutional capacity. This will be done through the four components below:
Component 1: Build projects for greening Penang;

Component 2: Build projects for stormwater and flood management;

Component 3: Comprehensive vulnerability / baseline assessment and action plans in targeted communities;

Component 4: Social resilience programme;

Component 5: Institutional capacity and knowledge transfer platform.

This is the first submission of the concept note, using a two-step approach.

The initial review found that the suite of interventions proposed here are quite innovative and interesting, and also potentially highly effective and replicable, in that they would generate numerous valuable benefits or co-benefits, as based on existing scientific evidence, in a cost-effective manner. There is clear value of exploring and supporting NBS for adaptation as an area with untapped potential, particularly given the flexibility, replicability, and relevance particularly for urban areas on the rise. To this end, the concept includes a strong knowledge management component.

The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

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

b) Request the secretariat to notify UN-Habitat of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision;

c) Encourage the Government of Malaysia to submit, through UN-Habitat, and following the reaccreditation of UN-Habitat, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph b), above.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/35)

The following proposal is being reviewed using the Ad Interim intersessional process.

Syrian Arab Republic: Climate Change Resilient Communities through Integrated Natural Resource Management in Eastern Ghouta in Rural Damascus, Syria (concept note; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); SYR/MIE/Water/2019/1; US$ 10,000,000).

This proposal was received, and its review completed while the Implementing Entity was accredited. It is currently in the status of “under re-accreditation”.

The objective of the proposed project is to enhance the climate change resilience of communities in Eastern Ghouta in Rural Damascus Governorate through sustainable and climate change resilient integrated natural resources management, including integration of water and land management to meet urban-rural natural resource needs. This will be done through the three components below:
a) **Component 1**: Integrated urban – rural Natural Resource including water and land Management to cope with climate change;

b) **Component 2**: Increase access to climate change resilient water supply systems for urban and agriculture purposes (i.e. avoid / minimize waste of water);

c) **Component 3**: Increase resilience of water-dependent livelihoods and security of income for vulnerable groups.

89. This is the first submission of the concept note, using a two-step approach.

90. The initial review found that the project needed to: provide more information on the cost-effectiveness of the proposed measures and the sustainability of the project. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

91. The final technical review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have been adequately addressed.

92. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

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

   b) Request the secretariat to notify UN-Habitat of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues:

      (i) The fully-developed project proposal should fully identify all activities and risks, including risks to biodiversity;

      (ii) The fully-developed project should provide a more detailed quantitative cost-effectiveness analysis of the proposed measures;

      (iii) The fully-developed proposal should include lessons learned, linkages and synergies with all the relevant past and ongoing projects in the region, including areas of overlap and complementarity; and

   c) Encourage the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to submit, through UN-Habitat, and following the reaccreditation of UN-Habitat, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph b), above.

   (Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/36)

**Regional projects and programmes**

**Fully-developed proposals**

*Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)*
Jordan, Lebanon: Increasing the Resilience of both Displaced Persons and Host Communities to Climate Change-Related Water Challenges in Jordan and Lebanon; (Fully-developed project; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); ASI/MIE/Urban/2018/PPC/1; US$ 13,973,509).

This proposal was received and its review completed while the Implementing Entity was accredited. It is currently in the status of “under re-accreditation”. Furthermore, this fully-developed proposal may be placed in the waitlist, subject to availability of resources under the MIE cap.

93. The objective of the proposed project is to better respond to climate change impacts and vulnerabilities in the context of the Syrian crisis in Jordan and Lebanon by demonstrating concrete adaptation measures that respond to the needs of both Displaced Persons (DPs) and host communities. This will be done through the four components below:

a) Component 1: Manage urban risks and vulnerabilities in the context of climate change, esp. water scarcity challenges, and urban (population) growth, incl. from DPs migration;

b) Component 2: Improve awareness, ownership and capacities to respond to climate change, incl. to operate, maintain and replicate resilient water harvesting, supply and irrigation systems;

c) Component 3: Expand unconventional water harvesting and supply options, using innovative and replicable techniques;

d) Component 4: Improving knowledge and policies and regulations to increase urban resilience in the region.

94. This is the second submission of the fully-developed project document, using a two-step approach.

95. The initial review found that the project needed to provide more clarity and details on the climate analyses for the municipal plans, the potential adaptation measures and decisions that result from the plan and the sustainability of the urban observatories. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

96. The final technical review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have been adequately addressed. However, the revised document provides new details in that the municipal plans address flood risks in addition to water scarcity, and the suggested data and analyses to be undertaken would not suitably inform flood risk management.

97. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

a) Note the recommendation that the Adaptation Fund Board:

   (i) Approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;

   (ii) Approve the funding of US$ 13,973,509 for the implementation of the project, as requested by UN-Habitat; and
(iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UN-Habitat as the multilateral implementing entity for the project. The agreement should include a commitment from UN-Habitat that, prior to first disbursement, UN-Habitat will submit a detailed methodology of the risk analyses and the data that needs to be collected in order to effectively inform management of water scarcity and flood risks at the municipal level.

b) Place the project on the waitlist pursuant to Decisions B.17/19, B.19/5, B.28/1 and B.33/11, with the understanding that funding, once available, can only be approved if UN-Habitat has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/37)

Thailand, Viet Nam: Mekong EbA South: Enhancing Climate Resilience in the Greater Mekong Sub-region through Ecosystem based Adaptation in the Context of South-South Cooperation; (Fully-developed project; United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); ASI/MIE/Water/2016/1; US$ 7,000,000).

This proposal was received and its review completed while the Implementing Entity was accredited. It is currently in the status of “under re-accreditation”. Furthermore, this fully-developed proposal may be placed in the waitlist, subject to availability of resources under the MIE cap.

98. The objective of the proposed project is to strengthen awareness and action of governments and communities in the Greater Mekong Sub-region (GMS) to adapt to climate change using an ecosystem-based approach (EbA). The project has the following three main components:

a) Component 1: Climate change adaptation interventions implemented by vulnerable communities in Thailand and Viet Nam to manage climate change impacts, particularly droughts and floods;

b) Component 2: Enhanced knowledge and awareness of adaptation measures, including EbA, to shared climate change impacts in different ecosystems to promote regional cooperation, planning and implementation of adaptation in the GMS;

c) Component 3: Strengthened regional cooperation on climate change adaptation, particularly in response to floods and droughts, in the GMS.

99. This is the fourth submission of the fully-developed project document, using a two-step approach.

100. The initial review noted that the Environmental and Social management Plan (ESMP) process will be completed during the early implementation stage, namely that an environmental and social assessment (ESA), an ESMP and Gender Action Plan will be completed during inception phase of the project. However, no information could be found on what is the budget for this work, and where in the budget table this is being reflected.
101. The final technical review finds that the information on the budget has been supplied, therefore the clarification request (CR) has been adequately addressed in the proposal.

102. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Note the recommendation that the Adaptation Fund Board:

      (i) Approve the fully-developed project document, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to the request made by the technical review;

      (ii) Approve the funding of US$ 7,000,000 for the implementation of the project, as requested by UNEP; and

      (iii) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with UNEP as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

   b) Place the project on the waitlist pursuant to Decisions B.17/19, B.19/5, B.28/1 and B.33/11, with the understanding that funding, once available, can only be approved if UNEP has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/38)

Concept proposals

Proposals from Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs)

Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Gambia (Republic of The), Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo: Scaling-up Climate-Resilient Rice Production in West Africa (Concept note; Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); AFR/RIE/Food/2019/PPC/1; US$ 14,000,000).

103. The objective of the proposed project is to improve climate resilience and increase rice system productivity of smallholder rice farmers across West Africa using a climate-resilient rice production approach. This will be done through the three components below:

   a) Component 1: Strengthen human and institutional capacity in Climate-Resilient Rice Production (CRRP);

   b) Component 2: Assist farmers to scale up CRRP;

   c) Component 3: Strengthen communication, advocacy and partnerships to scale-up CRRP.

104. This is the second submission of the concept note, using a three-step approach.

105. The initial review found that the project needed to provide more information on compliance with the Fund’s environmental and social policy, clarify complementarity with other projects in the
region, improve assessment of the potential risks of the project. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

106. The final technical review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have been adequately addressed.

107. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) to the request made by the technical review;

   b) Request the secretariat to notify OSS of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues:

      (i) The fully-developed project proposal should provide a full demonstration of compliance with all of the fund’s environmental and social principles.

   c) Approve the project formulation grant of US $ 80,000;

   d) Request OSS to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Governments of Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Republic of The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo; and

   e) Encourage the Governments of Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Republic of The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo to submit, through OSS, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph b), above.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/39)

Angola, Namibia: Resilience Building as Climate Change Adaptation in Drought-struck Southwestern African Communities (Concept note; Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); AFR/RIE/Rural/2019/PPC/1; US$ 11,880,000).

108. The objective of the proposed project is to contribute towards overcoming the effects of prolonged dry spells and periods of drought on climate-vulnerable rural populations in the cross-border Okavango Delta region of Angola and Namibia. The project aims to achieve this through three components:

   a) **Component 1**: Strengthening awareness, knowledge and capacity to adapt to climate change and variability at community, district, national and regional level;

   b) **Component 2**: Organizational and technical learning for climate-resilient production and water management;

   c) **Component 3**: Improving resilience of ecosystems and livelihoods through the implementation of community adaptation actions to improve food security in response to climate change and variability.
109. This is the second submission of the concept note, using a three-step approach.

110. The initial review found that the project needed to address a number of issues, such as synergies and risk of overlap with other activities, and demonstration of the full cost of adaptation reasoning, sustainability and innovation. A number of elements would need to be considered and taken into account during the formulation of the full proposal. This relates in particular to issues of innovation, gender, cost-effectiveness, and compliance with the ESP. A few clarification requests (CR) were made.

111. The final technical review finds that the clarification requests were adequately addressed. For those matters where further information would be desirable, a clear path has been presented on how this would be addressed during the formulation of the full proposal.

112. The PPRC decided to **recommend** to the Board to:

   a) Endorse the concept note as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) to the request made by the technical review;

   b) Request the secretariat to notify OSS of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issue:

      (i) The fully-developed project proposal should strengthen issues pertaining to innovation, gender, cost-effectiveness, and compliance with the ESP.

   c) Approve the project formulation grant of US$ 80,000;

   d) Request OSS to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Governments of Angola and Namibia; and

   e) Encourage the Governments of Angola and Namibia to submit, through OSS, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph b), above.

   *(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/40)*

**Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)**

**Antigua and Barbuda, and St Lucia: Increasing Resilience of the Education System to Climate Change Impacts in the Eastern Caribbean Region** (Regional concept; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); LAC/MIE/Urban/2019/PPC/1; US$ 13,662,863).

*This proposal was received and its review completed while the Implementing Entity was accredited. It is currently in the status of “under re-accreditation”.*

113. The objective of the proposed project is to enhance the resilience of the Eastern Caribbean region’s education sector, with activities targeted in Antigua and Barbuda, and St Lucia. Resilience in the sector will be enabled through the three components below:
a) **Component 1**: strengthening the enabling environment for adaptation planning within the education sector at the national and regional level;

b) **Component 2**: strengthening the capacity of schools, businesses, communities and households to understand climate risks and adaptation options, and cope with socio-emotional impacts;

c) **Component 3**: climate-proofing select school buildings to improve resilience to, and recovery from, extreme climate events.

114. This is the second submission of the regional concept, using a three-step approach.

115. The initial review raised a number of CRs to be addressed, including (1) contingency plans being made assuming Dominica is reintegrated into the proposal at full project development stage, (2) the impact of the capacity building activities, (3) the cost-effectiveness of the proposed adaptation measures, and (4) the novelty of the concrete measures. A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

116. The final review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the initial review have been addressed. There are some CRs and CARs raised in this final review that the project proponents should be considered at full project development stage, particularly, the need to provide justifications where relevant, on how project sustainability will be maintained over the course (and after) the project timeline.

117. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Note the recommendation that the Adaptation Fund Board:

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

   (ii) Request the secretariat to notify UN-Habitat of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues:

      (i) The fully-developed project proposal should consider the impact of capacity building activities and provide overall justification on how project sustainability will be maintained.

   (iii) Approve the project formulation grant of US $ 80,000;

   (iv) Request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government/s of Antigua and Barbuda, and St Lucia and;

   (v) Encourage the Governments of Antigua and Barbuda, and St Lucia to submit, through UN-Habitat, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph b), above.
b) Place the project on the waitlist pursuant to Decisions B.17/19, B.19/5, B.28/1 and B.33/11, with the understanding that funding, once available, can only be approved if UN-Habitat has the status of “accredited” with the Fund, as defined in document AFB/B.34/5.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/41)

The following proposal is being reviewed using the **Ad Interim intersessional process**.

Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe: Building Resilience of Agricultural Systems to Climate Change in Three Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in West and Central Africa (Concept note; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); AFR/MIE/Agric/2020/1; US$ 14,000,000).

118. The objective of the proposed project is to build climate-resilient agricultural systems in the three SIDS in West and Central Africa by securing water resources for agricultural and domestic usages and rehabilitating degraded lands to increase the climate resilience of agrarian ecosystems and enhance agricultural productivity. It proposes to achieve its stated objective through three main components:

   a) **Component 1**: Implementation of climate resilience agricultural practices;

   b) **Component 2**: Capacity building to sustain project interventions;

   c) **Component 3**: Monitoring Evaluation and Learning.

119. This is the first submission of the concept note, using a two-step approach.

120. The initial review found the programme concept proposes concrete adaptation actions for addressing climate change vulnerabilities in the three small islands developing states (SIDS). However, it needed to better demonstrate alignment with AF requirements and policies. Several clarification requests (CRs) and corrective action requests (CARs) were made related to gender mainstreaming, stakeholder consultations, sustainability, and compliance with the AF Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy (GP).

121. The final technical review finds that CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have been adequately addressed.

122. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Endorse the concept note, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to the request made by the technical review;

   b) Request the secretariat to notify the IFAD of the observations in the technical review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following issues:

      (i) The fully-developed proposal should completely identify proposed hard measures, as well location specifications for the selected interventions;
At fully-developed proposal stage, unidentified sub-projects need to be identified, environmental and social policy risk findings should to be appropriately updated where required, and environmental and social management plan should be commensurate to the risk findings.

c) Approve the project formulation grant of US $100,000;

d) Encourage the Governments of Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau, and Sao Tome and Principe to submit, through IFAD, a fully-developed project proposal that would also address the observations under subparagraph b), above

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/42)

123. Having considered the issues raised in documents AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/22 and Add.1, the PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

a) Note the recommendations of the Project and Programme Review Committee to approve the following projects/programmes:

   (i) Cambodia (AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/29);
   (ii) Jordan, Lebanon (AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/32);

b) Add to the waitlist established according to subparagraph b)(ii) Decision B.28/1 and which merges regional and MIE project/programme pipelines and prioritizes according to subparagraph a) of Recommendation PPRC 26.a-26.b/19 the projects/programmes listed in the subparagraph a) above; and

c) Consider, according to Recommendation PPRC 26.a-26.b/19, the projects/programmes added to the waitlist for Board approval in the order of rank in which they are listed in subparagraph a) above and behind the project previously placed on the waitlist according to Decision B.35.a-35.b/25.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/43)

Proposals for the innovation small grants

The following proposal is being reviewed using the Ad Interim intersessional process.

Antigua and Barbuda: Innovative technologies for improved water availability to increase food security in Antigua and Barbuda (Innovation Small Grant; Department of Environment, Ministry of Health, Wellness and the Environment (DOE); ATG/NIE/Water/2020/1/Innovation; US$ 250,000).

This proposal was received and its review completed while the Implementing Entity was accredited. It is currently in the status of “under re-accreditation”.
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124. The objective of the project is to improve water and food security in Antigua and Barbuda by facilitating the availability and use of ground or surface water for agricultural purposes to vulnerable populations via innovative technologies. The proposed technologies would run on self-generating renewable power, making them resilient to disruptions from grid instabilities or extreme climate events. The project aims to achieve its objective through the following two proposed project components:

a) **Component 1**: Test the use of innovative technology to increase availability of water for agriculture; and

b) **Component 2**: Standards and policy developed to ensure sustained availability of water for agriculture.

125. This is the first submission of the innovation small grant proposal.

126. The initial review found that the rationale of the proposed project appeared to be sound and promising overall, with a strong adaptation reasoning and potential for accelerating the uptake of innovative adaptation technologies and practices to address a major vulnerability in Antigua and Barbuda. The combination of proposed activities appeared well-suited to address both urgent needs and assessing options for longer-term solutions for sustained water availability. A number of clarification requests (CRs), including related to details on benefits for vulnerable communities and different gender groups were requested. Furthermore, the potential for scaling up and capturing knowledge for other affected small island states was underexplored.

127. The revised proposal has addressed all clarification requests by providing additional information on direct and indirect project beneficiaries, selection criteria, benefits for targeted vulnerable groups including gender considerations, and knowledge sharing with other SIDS through regional networks.

128. The PPRC decided to **recommend** to the Board to:

a) Defer the consideration of the innovation small grant proposal for Antigua and Barbuda to the next PPRC meeting;

b) Request the secretariat to notify DOE of the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision, as well as the following additional issues:

   (i) The revised small grant innovation proposal should further strengthen the innovation rational of the proposed interventions within the respective legal and economic context;

   (ii) The proposal needs to strengthen the cost-effectiveness justification of the chosen interventions, inter alia through the consideration of alternative technologies;

c) Request DOE to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Antigua and Barbuda; and

d) Encourage the Government of Antigua and Barbuda to submit through DOE supplementary information addressing the issues raised under subparagraph b) no later than two weeks prior to the next PPRC meeting.
Dominican Republic: Strengthening of a Replicable Micro Ecosystem of Accelerated Technological Innovation for Adaptation and Mitigation to Climate Change in Dominican Republic through the Development of a Pilot Thermo Solar Desalination Appropriate Technology (Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral (IDDI); DOM/NIE/Water/2020/1/Innovation; US$ 249,929).

129. The objective of the proposed project is to accelerate the use of innovative technologies for adaptation to climate change in vulnerable marine-coastal areas in the sector of water management. The project aims to achieve its objective through the following three proposed project components:

   a) Component 1: Accelerated Development of an appropriate desalination technology including the prototype for testing at a Dominican Republic University;

   b) Component 2: Design and establishment of a process to test adaptation technologies in marginalized coastal communities, including the training of these communities for the management and operation of adaptation technologies;

   c) Component 3: Knowledge management to capture and disseminate lessons learned.

130. This is the second submission of the innovation small grant proposal.

131. The initial review found that while there is high potential for innovation and scaling up of a new desalination technology, the technology has not yet been fully developed. Further potential for innovation lies in the process of co-creation and co-financing of technological development with the private sector in a small island developing state. The review raised some issues regarding the full cost of adaptation reasoning and the co-financing included in the project budget, as discussed in a number of clarification requests (CRs).

132. The revised proposal has addressed all clarification requests by revising project activities and the related budget in order to achieve project outcomes independent from co-financing from the private sector, in line with the full cost of adaptation reasoning. The private sector will be engaged to enable scaling up of the technology once tested, contributing to the cost-effectiveness of the AF funded intervention. The revised project components are appropriate in the context of the objective of the small grants for innovation. The goal is the accelerated development and scaling up of an urgently required adaptation technology that would be appropriate for small, marginalised communities in tropical contexts, based on a concept that has been developed specifically for this context. There is a high potential for scaling up of such a technology to other affected coastal communities. Lastly, the selected project site in Montecristo seems well suited for the pilot testing.

133. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

   a) Approve the innovation small grant, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral (IDDI) to the requests made by the technical review;

   b) Approve the funding of US$ 249,929 for the implementation of the project, as requested by IDDI; and
c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with IDDI as the national implementing entity for the project.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/45)


134. The objective of the proposed project is to increase the resilience of communities to climate change risks such as floods through sustainable wetland management actions that enhance their adaptive capacities and livelihood alternatives in Okole wetland system. The project aims to achieve its objective through the following three proposed project components:

a) Component 1: Facilitating community-based wetland restoration planning and management;

b) Component 2: Supporting innovative and gender-based adaptive livelihoods options;

c) Component 3: Enhancing knowledge management and information sharing.

135. This is the first submission of the innovation small grant proposal.

136. The initial review found that the project seeks to address an important natural resource issue in Uganda using an Ecosystem-based Approach (EbA) approach. Furthermore, the Wetlands Management Department (WMD) within the Ministry of Water and Environment is very well placed to execute the project. The project however would benefit from justifying the innovativeness of the preferred approach as well as the climate change rationale, as discussed in a number of Clarification Requests (CRs) and a few Corrective Action Requests (CARs) raised in the review. The revised proposal has not sufficiently addressed all clarification and corrective action requests, especially related to justifying the innovativeness of the proposed approach and demonstrating compliance with the AF Environmental and Social Policy (ESP).

137. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

a) Not approve the innovation small grant, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Ministry of Water and Environment (MOWE) to the requests made by the technical review;

b) Suggest that the MOWE reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the technical review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board’s decision; and

c) Request MOWE to transmit the observations under subparagraph a) to the Government of Uganda.

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/46)
Proposal for learning grant

Senegal: Grant to facilitate learning and knowledge sharing (Learning grant; Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE); SEN/NIE/Multi/2019/1/Learning; ($ 144,848).

138. The Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE) of Senegal proposes to facilitate learning and knowledge sharing between implementing entities through i) the development of a knowledge management system for adaptation projects implemented by CSE with focus on coastal erosion, ii) development of tools (good practices, policy briefs and lessons learned) on adaptation project formulation, implementation and completion and iii) exchange visits with two NIEs about the Information and Knowledge Management System.

139. The initial technical review found that the proposal does not provide enough information on the activities proposed, the target audience and in general it lacks information related to outcome and output. A number of clarification requests (CR) and few corrective action requests (CAR) were raised to addressed by the proponent.

140. The final technical review finds that the corrective action requests (CAR) and clarification requests (CR) have been adequately addressed in the proposal.

141. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:

a) Approve the project, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE) to the request made by the technical review;

b) Approve the funding of US$ 144,848 for the implementation of the project, as requested by CSE; and

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

(Recommendation PPRC.26.a-26.b/47)

142. The summary information on the funding decisions recommendations is contained in the Table 6 below.
Table 6: Summary of PPRC 26.a-26.b funding decisions recommendations to the Adaptation Fund Board (26 August, 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Full Proposals:</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>Grant Size, USD</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>Single-country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td></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.26.a-26.b/23</td>
<td>963,456</td>
<td>963,456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not approve</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia (2)</td>
<td>Kemitraan</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/24</td>
<td>1,125,015</td>
<td>1,125,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>1,125,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia (3)</td>
<td>Kemitraan</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/25</td>
<td>820,444</td>
<td>820,444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not approve</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia (4)</td>
<td>Kemitraan</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/26</td>
<td>5,972,670</td>
<td>5,972,670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>5,972,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania (1)</td>
<td>NEMC</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/27</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not approve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania (3)</td>
<td>NEMC</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/28</td>
<td>1,280,000</td>
<td>1,280,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>1,280,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/29</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waitlist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/30</td>
<td>9,982,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,982,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>9,982,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/37</td>
<td>3,094,962</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,094,962</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>3,094,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/38</td>
<td>9,592,082</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,592,082</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>9,592,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/31</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not approve</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,230,629</td>
<td>11,561,585</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,669,044</td>
<td>31,046,729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Concepts: Single-country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>Grant Size, USD</th>
<th>NIE funding, USD</th>
<th>RIE funding, USD</th>
<th>MIE funding, USD</th>
<th>Funding set aside, USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>BTFEC</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/44</td>
<td>9,950,535</td>
<td>9,950,535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>MOWE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/41</td>
<td>2,249,000</td>
<td>2,249,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/42</td>
<td>4,989,915</td>
<td>4,989,915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/39</td>
<td>9,890,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,890,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/43</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria Arab Republic</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/40</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total, USD**

| NIE       | 47,079,450 | 17,189,450 | - | $29,890,000 |

### 3. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) / Project Formulation Assistance (PFA): Single-country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>Grant Size, USD</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>Bhutan</td>
<td>BTFEC</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/44/Add.1</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>BTFEC</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/44/Add.2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>MOWE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/41/Add.1</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>MOWE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/41/Add.2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/42/Add.1</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/42/Add.2</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total, USD**

| NIE       | 147,000 | 147,000 | - | 70,000 |

### 4. Full Proposals: Regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Countries</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>Grant Size, USD</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand, Viet Nam</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/33</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waitlist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20,973,509</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20,973,509</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Concepts: Regional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Countries</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>Grant Size, USD</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>RIE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo</td>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/35</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola, Namibia</td>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/34</td>
<td>11,880,000</td>
<td>11,880,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse</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>Antigua and Barbuda, and St Lucia</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/36</td>
<td>13,662,863</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,662,863</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/45</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>53,542,863</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25,880,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>27,662,863</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Project Formulation Grants: Regional Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region/Countries</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>Grant Size, USD</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><strong>RIE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d’Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo</td>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/35/Add.1</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola, Namibia</td>
<td>OSS</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/34/Add.1</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda, and St Lucia</td>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/36/Add.1</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve*</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabo Verde, Guinea Bissau, Sao Tome and Principe</td>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/45/Add.1</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>340,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>160,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>180,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>340,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL (1+2+3+4+5+6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>166,313,451</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,898,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,040,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>111,375,416</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31,456,729</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Innovation Small Grants</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>PPRC Document number</td>
<td>Grant Size, USD</td>
<td>NIE funding, USD</td>
<td>RIE funding, USD</td>
<td>MIE funding, USD</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIE</td>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>DOE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/47</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>IDDI</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/48</td>
<td>249,929</td>
<td>249,929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>MOWE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/49</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>749,929</strong></td>
<td><strong>749,929</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Learning Grants</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>IE</th>
<th>PPRC Document number</th>
<th>Grant Size, USD</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>NIE</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>AFB/PPRC.26.a-26.b/51</td>
<td>144,848</td>
<td>144,848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>144,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total, USD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>144,848</strong></td>
<td><strong>144,848</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>144,848</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1+2+3+4+5+6+7+8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167,208,228</td>
<td>29,792,812</td>
<td>26,040,000</td>
<td>111,375,416</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,851,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>