



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.28/4
06 October 2020

Project and Programme Review Committee
Twenty-eighth Meeting
Bonn, Germany (virtual), 11-13 October 2021

**REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT ON INITIAL
SCREENING/TECHNICAL REVIEW
OF PROJECT AND PROGRAMME PROPOSALS**

Background

1. This document presents to the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC) of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) an overview of the project/programme proposals submitted by Implementing Entities (IEs) to the current meeting, and the process of screening and technical review undertaken by the secretariat.
2. The analysis of the proposals mentioned above is contained in a separate addendum to this document.

Funding status under the MIE cap

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

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

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

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

(Decision B.12/9)

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

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

(Decision B.17/19)

5. According to the latest Financial Report prepared by the Trustee as of 30 June 2021, the cumulative funding decisions for all projects/programmes amounted to US\$ 847.80 million and funds available to support AF Board funding decisions amounted to US\$ 195.69 million. The cumulative funding decisions for projects/programmes submitted by MIEs amounted to US\$ 532.06 million. The Board had instituted, through decision B.12/9, a cap of 50 per cent for projects/programmes submitted by MIEs. Some categories of proposals submitted by MIEs had been excluded from counting towards the 50 per cent, and the cumulative funding decisions for MIE projects/programmes that counted towards it amounted to US\$ 519.58 million. Therefore, the funds available below the 50 per cent cap currently amount to US\$ 3.85 million.

Funding Window for Regional Projects and Programmes

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

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

(Decision B.25/28)

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

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

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

(Decision B.26/3)

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

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

(Decision B.27/5)

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

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

- (i) To prioritize the four projects and 10 project formulation grants as follows:
1. If the proposals recommended to be funded in a given meeting of the PPRC do not exceed the available slots under the pilot programme, all those proposals would be submitted to the Board for funding;
 2. If the proposals recommended to be funded in a given meeting of the PPRC do exceed the available slots under the pilot programme, the proposals to be funded under the pilot programme would be prioritized so that the total number of projects and project formulation grants (PFGs) under the programme maximizes the total diversity of projects/PFGs. This would be done using a three-tier prioritization system: so that the proposals in relatively less funded sectors would be prioritized as the first level of prioritization. If there are more than one proposal in the same sector: the proposals in relatively less funded regions are prioritized as the second level of prioritization. If there are more than one proposal in the same region, the proposals submitted by relatively less represented implementing entity would be prioritized as the third level of prioritization;
- (ii) To request the secretariat to report on the progress and experiences of the pilot programme to the PPRC at its twenty-third meeting; and
- (b) With regards to financing regional proposals beyond the pilot programme referred to above:
- (i) To continue considering regional proposals for funding, within the two categories originally described in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2: ones requesting up to US\$ 14 million, and others requesting up to US\$ 5 million, subject to review of the regional programme;
 - (ii) To establish two pipelines for technically cleared regional proposals: one for proposals up to US\$ 14 million and the other for proposals up to US\$ 5 million, and place any technically cleared regional proposals, in those pipelines, in the order described in decision B.17/19 (their date of recommendation by the PPRC, their submission date, their lower “net” cost); and
 - (iii) To fund projects from the two pipelines, using funds available for the respective types of implementing entities, so that the maximum number of or maximum total funding for projects and project formulation grants to be approved each fiscal year will be outlined at the time of approving the annual work plan of the Board.

(Decision B.28/1)

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

- (a) To merge the two pipelines for technically cleared regional proposals established in decision B.28/1(b)(ii), so that starting in fiscal year 2019 the provisional amount of funding for regional proposals would be allocated without distinction between the two categories

originally described in document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2, and that the funding of regional proposals would be established on a 'first come, first served' basis; and

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

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

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

(Decision B.31/3)

12. For the fiscal year 2020, the decision was taken by the Board to approve the same amounts as for the year 2019 (decision B.33/12).

13. Subsequently, for the fiscal year 2021, given the extraordinary set of circumstances brought on by the pandemic, having considered the proposal by the secretariat as contained in document AFB/PPRC.26.a26.b/22, and the recommendation by the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to:

(a) Include in its work plan for fiscal year 2021 the provision for an amount of US\$ 30 million to be provisionally set aside for the funding of regional project and programme proposals, including project formulation grant requests for preparing regional project and programme concept or fully-developed project documents;

(b) Consider the need for additional funding for regional project and programme proposals in the second half of fiscal year 2021.

(Decision B.35.a-35.b/75)

14. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to include in its work programme for fiscal year 2022 a provision for an amount of US\$ 60 million, to be provisionally set aside as follows:

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

(b) Up to US\$ 1 million for the funding of project formulation grant requests for preparing regional project and programme concept or fully-developed project documents.

(Decision B.36/1)

15. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board decided to revise the country cap as per the analysis contained in document AFB/B.36/5, increasing the country cap as follows:

(a) To revise the cap per country established by decision B.13/23 from US\$ 10 million to US\$ 20 million for all eligible developing country Parties, so that any Party could access a

total of up to US\$ 20 million from the Adaptation Fund once it had accessed funding amounting to at least US\$ 8 million for concrete single-country adaptation projects or programmes or once four years had passed since approval of the first concrete single-country adaptation project(s)/(programme(s) by the Board, whichever occurred earlier;

(b) To set a maximum level of US\$ 10 million for an individual funding request for single country concrete adaptation projects, provided that lower maximum levels could be set by the Board in specific circumstances, such as in the case of national implementing entities accredited through the streamlined process;

(c) To maintain the processes already put in place for the allocation of funding for regional projects and programmes, i.e., the provision on an annual basis (fiscal year) of a specific amount for the funding of regional project and programme proposals and the pipeline established through decision B.31/3;

(d) To assess implications of decision B.36/41 three years after the thirty-sixth meeting of the Board, taking into consideration resource availability, equitable access to funds, accreditation progress and programmatic development of the Fund;

(e) To inform the designated authorities and accredited implementing entities of this decision.

(Decision B.36/41)

16. The total amount funded for regional projects and programmes in the fiscal year 2022 to date is US\$ 11,941,038. Accordingly, the amount of funding currently remaining from the initial amount approved for the 2022 provision for regional programming is US\$ 48,058,962 and there are no regional projects or programmes currently on the waitlist.

17. At the present meeting the secretariat again received proposals for regional projects and programmes as encouraged by decision B.26/3, and as observed in decisions B.27/5 and B.31/3, and reviewed them, as explained further below.

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

18. Accredited implementing entities submitted 15 eligible single-country project proposals to the secretariat, with the total requested funding amounting to US\$ 108,789,060 (excluding formulation grants). The proposals included US\$ 8,354,181 or 8.26%¹ in Implementing Entities management fees and US\$ 8,339,915 or 8.30%² in execution costs.

19. Of the 15 projects, 7 are fully-developed project proposals. They were submitted by National and Multilateral Implementing Entities of the Fund; Bhutan Trust Fund for Environment Conservation (BT FEC), Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE), National Environment Management Council (NEMC), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat).

¹ The implementing entity management fee percentage is calculated compared to the project budget including the project activities and the execution costs, before the management fee.

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

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

21. All except one of the proposals are in compliance with Board Decision B.13/17 to cap execution costs at 9.5% of the project/programme budget. One proposal was requesting a PFG over the maximum amount allowed.

22. All proposals request funding below the cap available to each country, as per decision B.13/23 and decision B.36/41 on the *Provision of financial resources between single-country and regional concrete adaptation project and programmes (country cap)*. One of the proposals is by a NIE under the streamlined approach, and seven out of the fifteen proposals are from four different countries, requesting the additional US\$10 million available to them as per decision B.36/41.

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

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

(Decision B.12/7)

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

1. Full Proposals: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number
NIE			
	Bhutan	BTFEC	AFB/PPRC/28/5
	Tanzania (United Republic of) (1)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC/28/6
	Tanzania (United Republic of) (2)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC/28/7
	Uganda (1)	MOWE	AFB/PPRC/28/8
MIE			
	Côte d'Ivoire	IFAD	AFB/PPRC/28/9
	Haiti	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC/28/10
	Malaysia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC/28/11
2. Concepts: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number
NIE			
	Costa Rica	Fundecooperación	AFB/PPRC/28/12
	Honduras	CASM	AFB/PPRC/28/13
	Tanzania (United Republic of) (3)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC/28/14
	Uganda (2)	MoWE	AFB/PPRC/28/15
RIE			
	Trinidad and Tobago	CAF	AFB/PPRC/28/16
MIE			
	Nicaragua	FAO	AFB/PPRC/28/17
	North Macedonia	FAO	AFB/PPRC/28/18
	Vanuatu	FAO	AFB/PPRC/28/19

Project/programme proposals submitted by implementing entities: regional proposals

25. Accredited IEs submitted to the secretariat eight eligible proposals for regional projects and programmes. The total requested funding of those proposals amounted to US\$ 109,490,386 (excluding formulation grants). One of the proposals was a fully-developed project. The total requested funding for the fully-developed regional proposal included \$1,080,095 or 8.36% in Implementing Entities' management fees and US\$ 1,120,905 or 8.68% in execution costs.

26. The proposals were submitted by six MIEs: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), United Nations World Food Programme (WFP), and World Meteorological Organization (WMO), and one RIE: Sahara and Sahel Observatory (OSS). Details of the regional proposals are contained in the separate PPRC working documents, as follows:

4. Full Proposals: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number
RIE			
	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia (Republic of The), Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo	OSS	AFB/PPRC/28/20
5. Concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number
MIE			
	Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe	IFAD	AFB/PPRC/28/21
	Cuba, Panama	FAO	AFB/PPRC/28/22
	India, Sri Lanka	WFP	AFB/PPRC/28/23
7. Pre-concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number
RIE			
	Benin, Togo	OSS	AFB/PPRC/28/24
MIE			
	Cambodia, Lao (People's Democratic Republic), Myanmar, Thailand, Viet Nam	WMO	AFB/PPRC/28/25
	Cambodia, Viet Nam	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC/28/26
	Costa Rica, Panama	UNEP	AFB/PPRC/28/27

The review process

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

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

29. The secretariat subsequently reviewed the IEs' responses to the clarification requests, and compiled comments and recommendations that are presented in the addendum to this document (AFB/PPRC.28/4/Add.1).

Issues Identified during the Review Process

Issues Related to the Multilateral Implementing Entity Cap

30. As mentioned above, based on the latest Financial Report prepared by the Trustee (as of 30 June 2021), and excluding certain projects as necessary, the funds available for projects submitted by MIEs below the 50% cap amounted to US\$ 3.85 million.

31. Accordingly, three single country proposals to be implemented by MIEs and submitted for consideration at this review cycle, may need to be placed on the waitlist. It will be subject to availability of resources and respecting the 50 per cent cap set for projects and programmes submitted by MIEs.

Issues Related to the Unidentified Sub-projects

32. During the technical review process of this cycle as well as the intersessional cycle between the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh board meetings, it has been found that a large number of proposals originally submitted include Unidentified Sub-projects (USPs). In most proposals with USPs, an adequate justification for the use of USPs as required in Annex 2 of the document AFB/B/32-33/7 and the specific implementation arrangements to comply with the Fund's Environmental and Social Policy (ESP) and Gender Policy (GP) are not provided. For some proposals, USPs represented a considerable size of the budget (generally over 30%). Most proposals with USPs were not fully justified and do not refer to the COVID pandemic as exceptional circumstances, but rather that USPs were part of the originally-envisaged project design. Additionally, most proposals with USP present issues with ESP and GP compliance.

33. Given the challenges that USPs in projects/programmes present to demonstrate compliance with the ESP and GP, the PPRC might wish to request the secretariat to document the practice of using USPs in the submitted proposals for the Board's consideration and their implementation as monitored in the Project Performance Reports (PPRs). This would allow to define the best approach to be taken to further avoid the unjustified use of USPs in the submitted proposals and to ensure that the USPs approach remains available for those projects/programmes where it would provide added value in terms of the adaptation outcome, whilst complying with the ESP and GP.

Issues Related to the Execution Services and Costs

34. The secretariat identified that several proposals recently submitted for the Board's consideration, presented project/programme implementation arrangements whereby the Implementing Entity (IEs) was involved in the execution of the project/programme. According to the Fund's Policy on Project/Programme Implementation (OPG Annex 7), this is possible on an exceptional basis, when IEs are requested by the Government to provide all or part of the execution services. Further, according to the Policy, the execution costs for projects/programmes implemented and executed by the same entity are capped at 1.5% of the project/programme cost. The current rules do not specify if, for example, in case of IE providing only a small portion of the execution services, the 1.5% cap is applied just to the activities executed by the IE, or if it applies to the entire project cost. In case of the latter, this would mean that other Executing Entities (EEs)

would only be entitled to the execution cost(s) limited to a portion of the 1.5%, instead of a portion of up to 9.5% of project/programme cost, while the IE would still also receive 8.5% as the IE fees.

35. In addition, the Policy does not include specific guidance on whether capping the execution costs at 1.5% applies also to the regional projects/programmes, for which the administrative costs (IE management fee and project/programme execution costs) should be at or below 20% of the total project/programme budget, which is intended to provide IEs with more flexibility as required for the added complexity of managing a regional project or programme. To this end, the PPRC might wish to consider providing clear guidance to IEs on the application of provisions contained in the OPG Annex 7.

Issues Related to the Project Formulation Grants and Project Formulation Assistance Grants

36. It has been identified in this and previous review cycles that the uses of Project Formulation Grants (PFG) and Project Formulation Assistance grants (PFAs, capped at US\$ 20,000, available only to NIEs) can be quite similar, given that PFA-eligible activities are also eligible for funding under PFGs. The Adaptation Fund Board has made PFGs available to accredited NIEs of the Adaptation Fund (the Fund) to build the capacity of NIEs in project preparation and design. NIEs that are at the concept development stage of the Fund's project cycle process have the option to request a PFG up to a maximum of US\$ 30,000 per project together with their submission of the project concept to the Board. PFGs can support project formulation activities, including among others feasibility studies or consultations. A PFG could only be awarded when a project concept has been presented to and endorsed by the Board.

37. PFA grants were established so that accredited NIEs that are going through the 2-step project approval process could strengthen their capacity to undertake the necessary technical assessments related to the design and development of adaptation projects and programmes by tapping into external expertise through short-term consultancies. The PFA grants are meant to help NIEs undertake specific technical assessments such as environmental impact assessments and vulnerability assessments. Although these activities are eligible for funding under PFGs, some NIEs have expressed that US\$ 30,000 is insufficient to cover all the activities needed during project preparation.

38. Given the practically unclear differences between the two types of grants, the PPRC may wish to consider eliminating PFAs entirely and revising the PFG maximum amount instead, which would help make the process of applying for such grants more streamlined and efficient.

Recommendation

39. The PPRC may wish to recommend that the Board decide:

- (a) To request the Secretariat to analyze the issues related to the use of Unidentified Sub-projects (USPs), and present the findings at the twenty-ninth meeting of the PPRC;
- (b) That for all projects, where the Implementing Entity (IE) provides a portion of the execution services, the execution cost of the IE will be limited proportionately to the cost of the part of the project or programme executed by the IE;

- (c) To request the Secretariat to clarify regional implementation and execution costs, including where IE provides part or all of execution services, and present the findings at the twenty-ninth meeting of the PPRC;
- (d) To raise the maximum amount of individual Project Formulation Grant available to national implementing entities to US\$ 50,000;
- (e) To discontinue Project Formulation Assistance grants for future review cycles.

Table: Project proposals submitted to the thirty-seventh Adaptation Fund Board meeting (AFB 37)

1. Full Proposals: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
NIE								
	Bhutan	BT FEC	AFB/PPRC/28/5	9,998,955	779,536	8.46%	600,000	6.51%
	Tanzania (United Republic of) (1)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC/28/6	2,500,000	180,084	7.76%	201,271	8.68%
	Tanzania (United Republic of) (2)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC/28/7	4,000,000	287,950	7.76%	322,050	8.68%
	Uganda (1)	MOWE	AFB/PPRC/28/8	2,249,000	162,000	7.76%	181,000	8.67%
MIE								
	Côte d'Ivoire	IFAD	AFB/PPRC/28/9	6,000,000	470,046	8.50%	108,431	1.96%
	Haiti	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC/28/10	9,916,344	734,544	8.00%	867,000	9.44%
	Malaysia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC/28/11	10,000,000	783,410.00	8.50%	799,613	8.68%
Sub-total, USD				44,664,299	3,397,570		3,079,365	
2. Concepts: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
NIE								
	Costa Rica	Fundecooperación	AFB/PPRC/28/12	10,000,000	780,000	8.46%	860,000	9.33%
	Honduras	CASM	AFB/PPRC/28/13	4,000,000	340,000	9.29%	380,000	10.38%
	Tanzania (United Republic of) (3)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC/28/14	3,500,000	252,000	7.76%	282,000	8.68%
	Uganda (2)	MoWE	AFB/PPRC/28/15	9,504,600	760,000.00	8.69%	744,600	8.51%
RIE								
	Trinidad and Tobago	CAF	AFB/PPRC/28/16	10,000,000	700,000	7.53%	750,000	8.06%
MIE								
	Nicaragua	FAO	AFB/PPRC/28/17	10,000,000	783,400	8.50%	875,000	9.49%
	North Macedonia	FAO	AFB/PPRC/28/18	9,991,711	782,761	8.50%	798,950	8.68%
	Vanuatu	FAO	AFB/PPRC/28/19	7,128,450	558,450	8.50%	570,000	8.68%
Sub-total, USD				64,124,761	4,956,611		5,260,550	
4. Full Proposals: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
RIE								
	Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia (Republic of The), Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo	OSS	AFB/PPRC/28/20	14,000,000	1,080,095	8.36%	1,120,905	8.68%
Sub-total, USD				14,000,000	1,080,095		1,120,905	
5. Concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
MIE								
	Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe	IFAD	AFB/PPRC/28/21	13,932,000	1,032,000	8.00%	645,500	5.00%
	Cuba, Panama	FAO	AFB/PPRC/28/22	14,000,000	1,190,000	9.29%	1,330,000	10.38%
	India, Sri Lanka	WFP	AFB/PPRC/28/23	13,995,524	1,096,424	8.50%	1,119,100	8.68%
Sub-total, USD				41,927,524	3,318,424		3,094,600	
7. Pre-concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
RIE								
	Benin, Togo	OSS	AFB/PPRC/28/24	14,000,000	960,000	7.36%	1,040,000	7.98%
MIE								
	Cambodia, Lao (People's Democratic Republic), Myanmar, Thailand, Viet Nam	WMO	AFB/PPRC/28/25	13,662,862	1,070,362	8.50%	1,092,500	8.68%
	Cambodia, Viet Nam	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC/28/26	14,000,000	1,097,000	8.50%	1,225,785	9.50%
	Costa Rica, Panama	UNEP	AFB/PPRC/28/27	11,900,000	930,000	8.48%	950,000	8.66%
Sub-total, USD				53,562,862	4,057,362		4,308,285	

3. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) / Project Formulation Assistance (PFA): Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD
NIE				
PFG	Costa Rica	Fundecoperación	AFB/PPRC/28/12/Add.1	30,000
PFA	Costa Rica	Fundecoperación	AFB/PPRC/28/12/Add.2	20,000
PFG	Honduras	CASM	AFB/PPRC/28/13/Add.1	30,000
PFA	Honduras	CASM	AFB/PPRC/28/13/Add.2	20,000
PFG	Tanzania (United Republic of) (3)	NEMC	AFB/PPRC/28/14/Add.1	30,000
PFG	Uganda (2)	MoWE	AFB/PPRC/28/15/Add.1	45,000
Sub-total, USD				175,000
6. Project Formulation Grants (PFG): Regional Concepts	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD
MIE				
PFG	Cuba, Panama	FAO	AFB/PPRC/28/22/Add.1	100,000
PFG	India, Sri Lanka	WFP	AFB/PPRC/28/23/Add.1	80,000
Sub-total, USD				180,000
8. Project Formulation Grants (PFG): Regional pre-concepts	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD
RIE				
PFG	Benin, Togo	OSS	AFB/PPRC/28/24/Add.1	20,000
MIE				
PFG	Cambodia, Lao (People's Democratic Republic), Myanmar, Thailand, Viet Nam	WMO	AFB/PPRC/28/25/Add.1	19,980
PFG	Cambodia, Viet Nam	UNIDO	AFB/PPRC/28/26/Add.1	20,000
PFG	Costa Rica, Panama	UNEP	AFB/PPRC/28/27/Add.1	20,000
Sub-total, USD				79,980