



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.27-28/8  
12 July 2021

---

Adaptation Fund Board  
Project and Programme Review Committee

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

## Background

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

- (a) *Arrange one intersessional project/programme review cycle annually, during an intersessional period of 24 weeks or more between two consecutive Board meetings, as outlined in document AFB/PPRC.14/13;*
- (b) *While recognizing that any proposal can be submitted to regular meetings of the Board, require that all first submissions of concepts and fully-developed project/programme documents continue to be considered in regular meetings of the PPRC;*
- (c) *Request the secretariat to review, during such intersessional review cycles, resubmissions of project/programme concepts and fully-developed project/programme documents submitted on time by proponents for consideration during such intersessional review cycles;*
- (d) *Request the PPRC to consider intersessionally the technical review of such proposals as prepared by the secretariat and to make intersessional recommendations to the Board;*
- (e) *Consider such intersessionally reviewed proposals for intersessional approval in accordance with the Rules of Procedure;*
- (f) *Inform implementing entities and other stakeholders about the new arrangement by sending a letter to this effect, and make the calendar of upcoming regular and intersessional review cycles available on the Adaptation Fund website and arrange the first such cycle between the twenty-third and twenty-fourth meetings of the Board;*
- (g) *Request the PPRC to defer to the next Board meeting any matters related to the competencies of the Ethics and Finance Committee that may come up during the intersessional review of projects/programmes and to refrain from making a recommendation on such proposals until the relevant matters are addressed; and*
- (h) *Request the secretariat to present, in the fifteenth meeting of the PPRC, and annually following each intersessional review cycle, an analysis of the intersessional review cycle.*

*(Decision B.23/15)*

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

- (a) *Amend Decision B.23/15 and require that all first submissions of concepts under the two-step approval process and all first submissions of fully-developed project/programme documents under the one-step process continue to be considered in regular meetings of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC);*

- (b) *Request the secretariat to review, during its inter-sessional review cycles:*
- (i) *First submissions of fully-developed project/programme documents for which the concepts had already been considered in regular meetings of the PPRC and subsequently endorsed by the Board;*
  - (ii) *Resubmissions of project/programme concepts and resubmissions of fully-developed project/programme documents;*
- (c) *Request the PPRC to consider intersessionally the technical review of such proposals as prepared by the secretariat and to make intersessional recommendations to the Board;*
- (d) *Consider such intersessionally reviewed proposals for intersessional approval in accordance with the Rules of Procedure; and*
- (e) *Inform implementing entities and other stakeholders about the updated arrangement by sending a letter to this effect and make effective such amendment as of the first day of the review cycle between the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth meetings of the Board.*

*(Decision B.25/2)*

### **Project/programme proposals submitted by implementing entities**

3. The PPRC considered, during the intersessional review cycle between the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh meetings of the Board, two single-country fully-developed project proposals and four regional fully-developed 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 submitted to the intersessional review cycle between the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh Adaptation Fund Board meetings**

<b>PPRC Document Number</b>	<b>Document Title</b>
AFB/PPRC.27-28/2	Proposal for Uganda
AFB/PPRC.27-28/3	Proposal for Djibouti
AFB/PPRC.27-28/4	Proposal for Angola Namibia
AFB/PPRC.27-28/5	Proposal for Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, The Gambia (Republic of), Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo
AFB/PPRC.27-28/6	Proposal for Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Thailand, Viet Nam
AFB/PPRC.27-28/7	Proposal for Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana

4. The summary information on the proposals is contained in the Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Detailed list of project proposals submitted to the intersessional review cycle between the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh Adaptation Fund Board meetings**

1. Full Proposals: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
NIE								
	Uganda	MOWE	AFB/PPRC.27-28/2	2,249,000.00	164,940	7.91%	30,799	1.48%
MIE								
	Djibouti	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.27-28/3	5,339,285	418,285	8.50%	465,000	9.45%
	<i>Sub-total, USD</i>			<i>7,588,285</i>	<i>583,225</i>		<i>495,799</i>	
2. Full Proposals: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
RIE								
	Angola, Namibia	OSS	AFB/PPRC.27-28/4	11,941,038	900,000	8.15%	920,183	8.33%
	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia (Republic of The), Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo	OSS	AFB/PPRC.27-28/5	14,000,000	1,080,095	8.36%	1,120,905	8.68%
MIE								
	Cambodia, Lao (People's Democratic Republic), Thailand, Viet Nam	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.27-28/6	4,898,775	362,872	8.00%	374,524	8.26%
	Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.27-28/7	13,951,160	1,092,948	8.50%	1,195,600	9.30%
	<i>Sub-total, USD</i>			<i>44,790,973</i>	<i>3,435,915</i>		<i>3,611,212</i>	
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>52,379,258</b>	<b>4,019,140</b>		<b>4,107,011</b>	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### Single-country projects and programmes

#### Fully-developed proposals

*Proposals from National Implementing Entities (NIEs)*

*Regular proposals:*

Uganda: Enhancing Resilience of Communities and Fragile Ecosystems to Climate Change in Katonga Catchment, Uganda (Fully-developed project; Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE); UGA/NIE/Water/2019/1; US\$ 2,249,000).

5. 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 components below:

- a) Component 1: Strengthening the capacity of key grass root stakeholders for climate change adaptation.
- b) Component 2: Promoting appropriate water storage technologies for increased water and food security.

- c) Component 3: Supporting nature-based enterprises for sustainable socio-economic development.
  - d) Component 4: Knowledge management and information sharing.
6. This is the first submission of the fully-developed proposal, using a two-step approach.
7. The initial review found that the project needed to provide additional information on project activities and the use of Unidentified Sub-Projects (USPs), compliance with the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and the Gender Policy (GP), the budgets and the role of the Implementing Entity (IE) in project execution. A few clarification requests (CR) and corrective actions requests (CAR) were made.
8. The final technical review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have not been adequately addressed. Among the issues remaining are the limited information on project activities and the use of USPs, compliance with Fund's ESP and GP and the role of the IE in the project execution.
9. Furthermore, the public review of the proposal has resulted in comments from one source, collating comments from a number of civil society organizations in Uganda. The comments applaud the first submission by the National Implementing Entity of a full proposal, and provide a number of practical recommendations to facilitate the envisaged extension work, minimize corruption, increase the role of commercial providers of services and inputs, and improve public participation by involving media and cultural and religious leaders.
10. The PPRC decided to recommend to the Board to:
- (a) Not approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE) to the request made by the technical review;
  - (b) Suggest that MWE 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 fully identify all project activities and demonstrate compliance with the Environmental and Social Policy and the Gender Policy;
    - (ii) The proponent should reconsider its role in the execution of the project;
  - (c) Request MWE to transmit the observations under subparagraph b) to the Government of Uganda.

**(Recommendation PPRC.27-28/1)**

*Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)*

*Regular proposals:*

Djibouti: Integrated Water and Soil Resources Management Project (Projet de gestion intégrée des ressources en eau et des sols PROGRES) (Fully-developed project; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD); AF00000249; US\$ 5,339,285).

11. The objective of the proposed project is to improve climate resilience of vulnerable ecosystems and increase the adaptive capacity of the rural poor to respond to the impacts of climate change in Djibouti. This will be done through the three components below:

- a) Component 1: Sustainable management of climate-resilient water infrastructures.
- b) Component 2: Adaptation of agro-pastoral systems to climate change and enhancement of the resilience of targeted communities.
- c) Component 3: Capacity building and knowledge management.

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

13. This proposal has been previously submitted for consideration for funding under the Adaptation Fund, and the initial technical review has found that the comments raised at the previous submission have been adequately addressed including questions on adaptation reasoning, cost-effectiveness, potential duplication with other projects and sustainability of proposed. No further clarification was needed.

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

- (a) Approve the fully-developed project proposal submitted by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD);
- (b) Approve the funding of US\$ 5,339,285 for the implementation of the project, as requested by IFAD;
- (c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with IFAD as the multilateral implementing entity for the project.

**(Recommendation PPRC.27-28/2)**

## **Regional projects and programmes**

### **Fully-developed proposals**

#### *Proposals from Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs)*

Angola and Namibia: Resilience Building as Climate Change Adaptation in Drought-Struck South-Western African Communities (Fully-developed project; Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS); AFR/RIE/Rural/2019/PPC/1; US\$ 11,941,038).

15. The objective of the proposed project is to enhance adaptation capacity and resilience of communities to climate change impacts and variability in the transboundary region between Angola and Namibia. This will be done through the three components below:

- a) Component 1: Strengthening awareness, knowledge and capacity to adapt to climate change and variability at community, district, national and regional levels.
- 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.

16. This is the second submission of the fully developed project proposal using a one-step approach.

17. The initial technical review found that the project proposal had adequately addressed the clarification requests (CRs) issued in the previous review cycle.

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

- (a) Approve the fully-developed project proposal submitted by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS);
- (b) Approve the funding of US\$ 11,941,038 for the implementation of the project, as requested by OSS;
- (c) Request the secretariat to draft an agreement with OSS as the regional implementing entity for the project.

**(Recommendation PPRC.27-28/3)**

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

19. 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.

20. This is the first submission of the fully-developed project, using a three-step approach.

21. The initial review found that the project needed to more information on the adaptation measures, the use of Unidentified Sub-Projects (USPs), cost-effectiveness, and compliance with

the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy (ESP). A few clarification requests (CR) and correctives actions requests (CAR) were made.

22. The final technical review finds that the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review have not been adequately addressed. Namely, issues remain related to acknowledging the use of USPs, compliance with the Fund's ESP and Gender Policy (GP), and the breakdown of the implementation fee and execution costs.

23. Furthermore, the public review of the proposal has resulted in comments from two sources, one a National NGO in Benin confirming that the objectives of the project are in line with Benin's priorities and expressing some concern that the National Implementing Entity participation in national steering committees may not be sufficient given their relative expertise. They also express concern that, where ministries are the executing entities, the project should ensure that bureaucracy and cumbersome procedures do not hamper its implementation. The other comment was received from a regional NGO which also confirms that the project is in line with national priorities and provided suggestions to improve market access and stressed the importance to engage with all sectors along the rice value chain.

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

- (a) Not approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) Suggest that OSS reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The proposal should ensure compliance with the Fund's guidance on Unidentified Sub-Projects;
  - (ii) The proponent should present a comparative cost-effectiveness evaluation with alternative adaptation options;
  - (iii) The proposal should provide clear information on marginalized and vulnerable groups identification and involvement in the consultation process;
- (c) Request OSS to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia (Republic of The), Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo.

**(Recommendation PPRC.27-28/4)**

*Proposals from Multilateral Implementing Entities (MIEs)*

Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Thailand, Viet Nam: Groundwater Resources in the Greater Mekong Subregion: Collaborative Management to Increase Climate Change Resilience (Fully-developed project; United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); ASI/MIE/Water/2015/1; US\$ 4,898,775).



25. The objective of the proposed project is to establish effective regional capacities, partnerships and network in the Greater Mekong Subregion (GMS: Vietnam, Lao PDR, Cambodia, Thailand) for the sustainable management and utilization of groundwater resources as an adaptation response to protect people, livelihoods and ecosystems from climate change impacts. This will be done through the five components below:

- a) Component 1: Groundwater Resource Assessment and Monitoring. Participating countries use a regional GMS approach to address challenges of climate change, sustainable water use and resilience for evidence-based decision-making and management.
- b) Component 2: Priority use and stakeholders. Groundwater users in different economic sectors have equitable access to requisite information and guidelines and are able to participate actively in groundwater management.
- c) Component 3: Resource management, information tools and equipment. Climate resilience and GW use in pilot areas are increased in an equitable and gender-balanced manner through adaptive technologies and approaches.
- d) Component 4: Regional cooperation, coordination, and information exchange. Regionally consistent management strategies for groundwater resources in support of CCA are adopted through effective stakeholder engagement in the GMS.
- e) Component 5: Capacity building and training. GMS stakeholders capably use project tools and knowledge on GW use for CCA and resilience.

26. This is the third submission of the fully developed project proposal, using a three-step approach.

27. The initial review found that the project needed to provide considerable information on the concrete activities envisaged under component 3 and a justification for the use of Unidentified Sub-Projects (USPs). The proposal also needed to demonstrate compliance with the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy (ESP); provide further details on elements that would contribute to the sustainability of interventions and, present the cost-effectiveness justification of proposed activities. Finally, the proposal needed to adequately describe the monitoring arrangements for activities described in the project's results framework. A number of clarification requests (CR) and corrective actions requests (CAR) were made.

28. The final technical review finds that the proposal addressed many of the previously raised comments. However, there are a few pending CRs and CARs related to further clarifying the project cost-effectiveness, details on the operation and maintenance costs of interventions, and compliance with the ESP specifically related to the justification for the USP approach.

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

- (a) Not approve the fully-developed project proposal, 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 provide a comparative assessment of the cost-effectiveness of the proposed measures with alternative measures, which includes an assessment of both the costs and the effectiveness of the proposed measures in treating the scale of the highlighted impacts, compared to other alternative measures;
  - (ii) The proposal should provide details of the estimated costs for operation and maintenance of the proposed Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR) solutions, including details of the involvement of water user associations and groundwater user organizations in the maintenance of MAR pilots;
  - (iii) The proponent should provide a clear and comprehensive justification for the Unidentified Sub-Projects approach in line with the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy;
- (c) Request UNESCO to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Thailand, and Viet Nam.

**(Recommendation PPRC.27-28/5)**

Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana: Improved Resilience of Coastal Communities in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana (Fully-developed project; United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat); AFR/MIE/DRR/2017/1; US\$ 13,951,160).

30. The objective of the proposed project is to increase the climate change resilience of coastal settlements and communities to climate-related coastal hazards in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana. This will be done through the five components below:
- a) Component 1: Promote climate change resilience through spatial development frameworks.
  - b) Component 2: Resilience building planning at the community level.
  - c) Component 3: Transformative concrete ecosystem/natural resource adaptation interventions at sub-regional and district level.
  - d) Component 4: Catalytic concrete climate change adaptation through diversified and strengthened livelihoods at community level.
  - e) Component 5: Knowledge sharing and monitoring.
31. This is the second submission of the fully developed project proposal, using a three-step approach.
32. The initial review found that the project needed to address several issues such as lack of climate change adaptation focus, insufficient demonstration of regional added value, the risk

of maladaptation, compliance with the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and the Gender Policy (GP), sustainability, innovation, the use of Unidentified Sub-Projects (USPs), project execution arrangements and administrative costs. A few clarification requests (CR) and corrective actions requests (CAR) were made.

33. The final technical review finds that the proposal has not adequately addressed the CR and CAR raised during the initial technical review. Issues remain related to the added value of the regional approach, the risk of maladaptation, compliance with the Fund's ESP and GP, sustainability, innovation, the use of USPs, project execution arrangements and administrative costs. No substantive changes were made to the proposed project activities.

34. Furthermore, the public review of the proposal has resulted in comments from two sources, one a local NGO endorsing the objectives of the project and expressing their interest to participate in the implementation of the project. The other mentioned the overall relevance of the project activities and provided suggestions to enhance "ground-level" regional learning, to address transboundary issues (as opposed to regional matters) and to improve participation of NGOs to provide additional sustainability.

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

- (a) Not approve the fully-developed project proposal, as supplemented by the clarification responses provided by the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) to the request made by the technical review;
- (b) Suggest that UN-Habitat reformulate the proposal taking into account the observations in the review sheet annexed to the notification of the Board's decision, as well as the following issues:
  - (i) The proposal should contain fully identified activities and focus on climate change adaptation, demonstrating the sustainability and innovative character of its activities whilst showing the added value of the chosen regional approach;
  - (ii) The proposal should demonstrate that the risk of maladaptation is avoided, as well as demonstrating compliance with the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy and the Gender Policy and ensure that project implementation arrangements are in compliance with the Fund's Operational Policies and Guidelines.
- (c) Request UN-Habitat to transmit the observations under subparagraph (b) to the Governments of Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana.

**(Recommendation PPRC.27-28/6)**

36. The summary information on the funding decisions recommendations is contained in the Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Summary of PPRC 27-28 funding decisions recommendations to the Adaptation Fund Board (June 28, 2021)**

1. Full Proposals: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
<b>NIE</b>								
	Uganda	MOWE	AFB/PPRC.27-28/2	2,249,000			<i>Not approve</i>	0
<b>MIE</b>								
	Djibouti	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.27-28/3			5,339,285	<i>Approve</i>	5,339,285
	<b>Sub-total, USD</b>			<b>2,249,000</b>		<b>5,339,285</b>		<b>5,339,285</b>
2. Full Proposals: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	NIE funding, USD	RIE funding, USD	MIE funding, USD	Decision	Funding set aside, USD
<b>RIE</b>								
	Angola, Namibia	OSS	AFB/PPRC.27-28/4		11,941,038		<i>Approve</i>	11,941,038
	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia (Republic of The), Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo	OSS	AFB/PPRC.27-28/5		14,000,000		<i>Not approve</i>	0
<b>MIE</b>								
	Cambodia, Lao (People's Democratic Republic), Thailand, Viet Nam	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.27-28/6			4,898,775	<i>Not approve</i>	0
	Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.27-28/7			13,951,160	<i>Not approve</i>	0
	<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>25,941,038</b>	<b>18,849,935</b>		<b>11,941,038</b>
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>2,249,000</b>	<b>25,941,038</b>	<b>24,189,220</b>		<b>17,280,323</b>