



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.30/3/Rev.1  
03 October 2022

---

Project and Programme Review Committee  
Thirtieth Meeting  
Bonn, Germany, 11-12 October 2022

Agenda item 3)

**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.

## Current single country cap

3. At the thirty-sixth meeting, having considered the analysis contained in document AFB/B.36/5, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

*(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;*

[...]

**(Decision B.36/41)**

4. At this time, one country (Costa Rica) has exhausted the funding available under the country cap as per Decision B.36/41. The specific amount currently available to each country depends on the conditions set in sub-paragraph (a).

## Funding status under the MIE cap

5. 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)**

6. 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)**

7. According to the latest Financial Report prepared by the Trustee as of 30 June 2022, the cumulative funding decisions for all projects/programmes amounted to US\$ 951.66 million and funds available to support AF Board funding decisions amounted to US\$ 219.25 million. The cumulative funding decisions for projects/programmes submitted by MIEs amounted to US\$ 587.15 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\$ 574.67 million. Therefore, the funds available below the 50 per cent cap currently amount to US\$ 12.82 million.

### **Funding Window for Regional Projects and Programmes**

8. 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)**

9. 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 (DAs) of the Adaptation Fund, and to Multilateral and Regional Implementing Entities (RIEs) accredited by the Board.

10. 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)**

11. 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)**

12. 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)**

13. At the twenty-ninth meeting, having considered the comments and recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee, the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board) decided:

- (a) *To include in its work plan for fiscal year 2018 a program of work amounting to US\$ 30 million for the funding of regional project and programme proposals, as follows:*
- (i) *Up to three proposals requesting up to US\$ 5 million for funding;*
  - (ii) *One proposal requesting up to US\$ 14 million of funding;*
  - (iii) *Up to five project formulation grant (PFG) requests, of up to US\$ 100,000 each, for preparing project and programme concepts or fully-developed project documents requesting up to US\$ 5 million of funding;*
  - (iv) *Up to five project formulation grant (PFG) requests, of up to US\$ 100,000 each, for preparing project and programme concepts or fully-developed project documents requesting up to US\$ 14 million of funding.*

**(Decision B.29/4)**

14. 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)**

15. 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).

16. 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.a-26.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)**

17. 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)**

18. 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)**

19. Having considered the recommendation of the Project and Programme Review Committee (PPRC), the Adaptation Fund Board decided to include in its work programme for the fiscal year 2023 a provision for the 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.38/5)**

20. Details of the accumulated funding allocations under the Funding Window for regional projects and programmes per Board decision are displayed below:

<b>Fiscal year</b>	<b>AF Board Decision</b>	<b>Amount in millions (USD)</b>
2015	B.25/28	30.00
2018	B.29/4	30.00
2019	B.31/3	60.00
2020	B.33/12	60.00
2021	B.35a-35b/75	30.00
2022	B.36/1	60.00
2023	B.38/5	60.00
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>330.00</b>

Remaining Funds Available under the Funding Window for Regional Projects and Programmes

21. The total amount funded for regional projects and programmes in the fiscal year 2023 to date is US\$ 18,146,896. Accordingly, the amount of funding currently remaining from the amount approved for the 2023 provision for regional programming is US\$ 41,853,104 and there are no regional projects or programmes currently on the waitlist.

22. 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**

23. Accredited implementing entities (IEs) submitted 30 eligible single-country project proposals to the secretariat, with the total requested funding amounting to US\$ 147,748,179.59 (excluding project formulation grants). The proposals included US\$ 11,096,760.44 or 8.08%<sup>1</sup> in IE management fees and US\$ 10,622,848.52 or 7.71%<sup>2</sup> in execution costs.

24. Of the 30 projects, 6 are fully-developed project proposals. They were submitted by the following National and Multilateral Implementing Entities of the Fund: Bhutan Trust Fund of Environmental Conservation (BT FEC), Environmental Management Agency (EMA), Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and United Nations Human Settlement Programme (UN-Habitat).

25. All except one of the proposals are in compliance with Board decision B.11/16 to cap management fees at 8.5%. In accordance with the same decision B.11/16, all proponents of fully-developed project documents provide a budget on fee use.

26. One of the proposals request an execution cost above the 9.5% allocated, while another proposal did not request an execution cost, all others are in compliance with Board Decision B.13/17 to cap execution costs at 9.5% of the project/programme budget.

27. All submissions for single countries 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)* -see table below. One of the proposals was submitted by a National Implementing Entity (NIE) under the streamlined approach, ten proposals were small size proposals (under USD 1 million) submitted by the same NIE, eighteen out of the thirty proposals are from ten different countries, and ten proposals from nine different countries are requesting part of the additional US\$10 million available to them as per decision B.36/41.

28. 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.



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)**

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

1. Full Proposals: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Country Cap (Funding Available)
<b>NIE</b>				
	Bhutan*	BT FEC	AFB/PPRC.30/4	10,000,000
	Uganda (1)	MoWE	AFB/PPRC.30/5	12,249,000
	Uganda (2)	MoWE	AFB/PPRC.30/6	12,249,000
	Zimbabwe*	EMA	AFB/PPRC.30/7	5,000,000
<b>MIE</b>				
	Montenegro*	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.30/8	10,000,000
	Sri Lanka	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.30/9	12,010,273
2. Concepts: Single- country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Country cap (Funding Available)
<b>NIE</b>				
	Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/10	10,278,559
	Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/11	10,278,559
	Indonesia (3)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/12	10,278,559
	Indonesia (4)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/13	10,278,559
	Indonesia (5)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/14	10,278,559
	Indonesia (6)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/15	10,278,559
	Indonesia (7)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/16	10,278,559
	Indonesia (8)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/17	10,278,559
	Indonesia (9)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/18	10,278,559
	Indonesia (10)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/19	10,278,559
	Mexico (1)*	IMTA	AFB/PPRC.30/20	10,000,000
	Mexico (2)*	IMTA	AFB/PPRC.30/21	10,000,000
	Mexico (3)*	IMTA	AFB/PPRC.30/22	10,000,000
	Niger	BAGRI	AFB/PPRC.30/23	10,089,000
	Peru	PROFONANPE	AFB/PPRC.30/24	10,108,315
	Tuvalu	MoF	AFB/PPRC.30/25	2,000,000
<b>RIE</b>				
	Fiji	SPC	AFB/PPRC.30/26	15,764,005
<b>MIE</b>				
	Georgia	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.30/27	10,038,706
	Guinea*	WFP	AFB/PPRC.30/28	10,000,000
	Lao (People's Democratic Republic)	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.30/29	10,000,000
	Libya*	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.30/30	10,000,000
	Maldives	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.30/31	11,010,775
	Mongolia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.30/32	10,004,765
	Zambia*	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.30/33	10,000,000

\* Additional \$10 M will be available when conditions stipulated in Decision B.36/41 are fulfilled.

### Project/programme proposals submitted by implementing entities: regional proposals

30. Accredited IEs submitted to the secretariat five eligible proposals for regional projects and programmes. The total requested funding of those proposals amounts to US\$ 68,000,205 (excluding project formulation grants). Three of the five proposals are fully-developed projects, one is a concept note, and one is a pre-concept. The total requested funding for the fully-developed regional proposal includes US\$ 3,464,120 or 9.50% in Implementing Entities' management fees and US\$ 3,235,749 or 8.85% in execution costs.

31. The proposals were submitted by four MIEs: United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), 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 separate PPRC working documents, as follows:

4. Full Proposals: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number
MIE			
	Antigua and Barbuda, Saint Lucia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.30/34
	El Salvador, Honduras	WFP	AFB/PPRC.30/35
	India, Sri Lanka	WFP	AFB/PPRC.30/36
5. Concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number
RIE			
	Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal	OSS	AFB/PPRC.30/37
7. Pre-concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number
MIE			
	Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu	WMO	AFB/PPRC.30/38

### The review process

32. The secretariat received 48 submissions for the AFB39 review cycle. Thirty-five (35) submissions were found to be eligible and, in accordance with the operational policies and guidelines, the secretariat screened and prepared technical reviews for them.

33. The eligible submissions were posted online for public review and the Adaptation Fund's NGO network as well as the Board were notified and invited to provide comments within a specified time period. One civil society organization provided comments on one project. No comments were received by the Secretariat from the Board.

34. 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. The secretariat received 6 requests of extension of the time available to resubmit a revised proposal to enable the IEs to address the requests received during the initial technical review.

35. 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.30/3/Add.1).

### **Issues Identified during the Review Process**

#### Continuous increase in the number of submitted proposals

36. The current cycle confirms the trend of steady continuous increase in the number of new proposals submitted to the Board, with the expectation that the programming volume would still continue to increase. The secretariat has prepared a set of possible options to enhance the review process and better organize the work under PPRC in view of expected continuing increase. These options are presented in paper AFB/PPRC.30/55 *Options for further supporting the work of the PPRC*.

#### Issues identified in the use of templates

37. In the current cycle, as for the previous ones, a number of IEs have submitted proposals with either sections missing, or sections that are not required at the current stage of the proposal. IEs have communicated that the issue is that the template for fully-developed proposals and concept notes is the same, and that it would be easier if the information on what sections are needed at concept note versus fully-developed proposal stage, which is currently located in OPG guidance, was more directly accessible within the templates.

38. To remediate to this situation, the secretariat proposes to produce separate guidance templates for the two stages. This would guide the IEs to separate templates and guidance, in order to better understand what sections and information are required at that stage of project development and avoid potential confusion and unnecessary work for that stage.

#### Issues identified with the page limits for regional projects

39. For the past few cycles, the secretariat has noticed that, for regional projects in particular, it is difficult for the IEs to remain within the page limits and effectively address all the clarification requests, which often require providing additional explanations and details. Currently, the IEs use the response sheets to provide the necessary responses and clarification and remain within the page limit. However, many of these details need to be within the main text of the proposal. This issue has been observed in this review cycle as well. The secretariat will continue to analyze the data from the upcoming submissions and communicate any relevant findings to the PPRC as needed.

#### Issues identified with the awareness of the Project Formulation Grants (PFGs)

40. NIEs that are submitting to the Fund for the first time in a two-step process seemed to be unaware of the possibility of accessing PFGs and of the benefits of requesting them. The secretariat will continue to promote the benefits of requesting PFGs during the technical reviews and will further highlight this in the Courtesy notice send to all IEs before each cycle.

Issues identified with the letters of endorsement

41. The secretariat initially received thirteen additional submissions that were either withdrawn by the entities or deemed ineligible by the secretariat. Twelve of these proposals could not be considered as their LOEs were not valid. These included 4 fully-developed single proposals, 2 single concepts, 2 fully-developed regional proposals, and 4 regional pre-concepts, while one fully-developed single-country proposal requested to withdraw after receiving the first technical review.

42. A number of proposals submitted in the recent review cycles were also found ineligible due to being accompanied by LOEs that were not valid. This is despite the specific invitation by the Secretariat to the IEs to submit the LOEs before submitting the proposals so they can be checked in advance and enable the IEs to address issues ahead of the submission deadline. Issues of LOEs cause significant delays in the review process, which are more difficult to manage with a high volume of proposals submitted.

43. Several proposals in this cycle and previous ones included LOEs that were properly issued and signed by the current Designated Authorities (DA), but the validity, according to Decision B.32/7, had expired. It had also been conveyed to the secretariat that this requirement is poorly understood and difficult to communicate or justify to the authorities involved, and therefore results in undue burden for the IE submitting the proposal. In order to increase efficiencies, it is proposed to remove the requirement of issuing a new letter by the same DA for the same proposal. Rather, the DA should communicate their withdrawal of the LOE directly to the Secretariat should they wish to do so.

44. The Secretariat has organized a training session at the NIE Annual Seminar held in September 2022 on the preparation of LOEs and will also consider additional sessions as needed to explain the LOE process.

Issues identified with the costs and fees

45. A recurring issue for the IEs is understanding the rules regarding the calculation of IE fee and EC costs. Recent decisions that clarify how costs should be split and allocated among Executing Entities (EEs), namely when one of the EEs is also the IE (i.e. Decision.38/42), accommodate different configurations of projects. As the portfolio continues to grow, including due to projects funded under the various new windows, the importance of clear and accessible rules on calculating IE fees and EC costs is greater than ever. The Secretariat proposes to consolidate and clarify the rules around costs and fees for all windows, with a view to simplifying and harmonizing to the extent possible.

**Recommendation**

46. The PPRC may wish to recommend to the Board to:
- (a) Request the secretariat to produce separate guidance templates for concept note and fully-developed project/programme proposal stages and make them available on the Adaptation Fund website;
  - (b) Allow to admit the resubmission of letters of endorsement for a project or programme that is signed by the Designated Authority on file, excluding cases

where there is a change in participant countries, target areas or institutional arrangements, superseding Decision B.32/7; and

- (c) Request the secretariat to consider the existing policies on implementation fees and execution costs for all financing windows, including on their use, and propose adjustments with a view to simplifying and harmonizing them, and present its recommendation to the Project and Programme Review Committee at its thirty-second meeting.

**Table:** Project proposals submitted to the thirty-ninth Adaptation Fund Board meeting (AFB 39)

1. Full Proposals: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
<b>NIE</b>								
	Bhutan	BTFC	AFB/PPRC.30/4	9,998,955	663,930	7.11%	520,950	5.58%
	Uganda (1)	MoWE	AFB/PPRC.30/5	2,249,000	143,000.00	6.79%	181,000.00	8.59%
	Uganda (2)	MoWE	AFB/PPRC.30/6	9,504,600	744,600	8.50%	760,000	8.68%
	Zimbabwe	EMA	AFB/PPRC.30/7	4,989,000	357,000	7.71%	432,000	9.33%
<b>MIE</b>								
	Montenegro	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.30/8	10,000,000	783,410	8.50%	873,612	9.48%
	Sri Lanka	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.30/9	2,000,000	156,691	8.50%	175,104	9.50%
<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>38,741,555</b>	<b>2,848,631</b>		<b>2,942,666</b>	
2. Concepts: Single-country	Country	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
<b>NIE</b>								
	Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/10	999,714.29	74,928.57	8.10%	87,142.86	9.42%
	Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/11	993,081	77,799	8.50%	79,408	8.68%
	Indonesia (3)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/12	996,633	78,077	8.50%	71,989	7.84%
	Indonesia (4)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/13	970,503	75,611	8.45%	83,758	9.36%
	Indonesia (5)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/14	960,225	75,225	8.50%	84,075	9.50%
	Indonesia (6)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/15	998,868	78,752	8.56%	80,944	8.80%
	Indonesia (7)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/16	998,738	14,760	1.50%	93,478	9.50%
	Indonesia (8)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/17	1,000,000	82,569	9.00%	208,744	22.75%
	Indonesia (9)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/18	977,939	76,613	8.50%	85,626	9.50%
	Indonesia (10)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/19	999,226	78,280	8.50%	87,490	9.50%
	Mexico (1)	IMTA	AFB/PPRC.30/20	1,059,941.30	83,036.87	8.50%	42,067.66	4.31%
	Mexico (2)	IMTA	AFB/PPRC.30/21	6,434,050	504,050	8.50%		0.00%
	Mexico (3)	IMTA	AFB/PPRC.30/22	3,255,000	115,000	3.66%	140,000	4.46%
	Niger	BAGRI	AFB/PPRC.30/23	10,000,000	739,400	7.98%	138,308	1.49%
	Peru	PROFONANPE	AFB/PPRC.30/24	5,465,145	428,145	8.50%	437,000	8.68%
	Tuvalu	MoF	AFB/PPRC.30/25	2,000,000	155,400	8.42%	171,300	9.29%
<b>RIE</b>								
	Fiji	SPC	AFB/PPRC.30/26	5,764,000	450,500	8.48%	504,500	9.49%
<b>MIE</b>								
	Georgia	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.30/27	9,846,766	771,406	8.50%	787,360	8.68%
	Guinea	WFP	AFB/PPRC.30/28	10,000,000	783,410	8.50%	799,613	8.68%
	Lao (People's Democratic Republic)	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.30/29	7,323,750	573,750	8.50%	641,250	9.50%
	Libya	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.30/30	9,997,156	783,187	8.50%	719,519	7.81%
	Maldives	UNESCO	AFB/PPRC.30/31	10,000,000	740,764	8.00%	764,550	8.26%
	Mongolia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.30/32	7,965,889	624,056	8.50%	697,470	9.50%
	Zambia	IFAD	AFB/PPRC.30/33	10,000,000	783,410	8.50%	874,590	9.49%
<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>109,006,624.59</b>	<b>8,248,129.44</b>		<b>7,680,182.52</b>	
4. Full Proposals: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
<b>MIE</b>								
	Antigua and Barbuda, Saint Lucia	UN-Habitat	AFB/PPRC.30/34	13,996,500	1,096,500	8.50%	1,225,500	9.50%
	El Salvador, Honduras	WFP	AFB/PPRC.30/35	12,048,300	1,095,300	10.00%	995,700	9.09%
	India, Sri Lanka	WFP	AFB/PPRC.30/36	13,995,524	1,272,320	10.00%	1,014,549	7.97%
<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>40,040,324</b>	<b>3,464,120</b>		<b>3,235,749</b>	
5. Concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
<b>RIE</b>								
	Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal	OSS	AFB/PPRC.30/37	14,000,000	1,064,250	8.23%	1,085,750	8.39%
<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>14,000,000</b>	<b>1,064,250</b>		<b>1,085,750</b>	
7. Pre-concepts: Regional	Region/Countries	IE	PPRC Document number	Grant Size, USD	IE Fee, USD	IE Fee %	Execution Cost, USD	EC %
<b>MIE</b>								
	Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu	WMO	AFB/PPRC.30/38	13,959,881	1,093,631	8.50%	1,116,250	8.68%
<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>13,959,881</b>	<b>1,093,631</b>		<b>1,116,250</b>	

<b>3. Project Formulation Grants (PFG): Single-country</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>IE</b>	<b>PPRC Document number</b>	<b>Grant Size, USD</b>
<b>NIE</b>				
	Indonesia (1)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/10/Add.1	50,000
	Indonesia (2)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/11/Add.1	50,000
	Indonesia (3)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/12/Add.1	50,000
	Indonesia (4)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/13/Add.1	50,000
	Indonesia (5)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/14/Add.1	50,000
	Indonesia (6)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/15/Add.1	50,000
	Indonesia (7)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/16/Add.1	50,000
	Indonesia (8)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/17/Add.1	50,000
	Indonesia (9)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/18/Add.1	50,000
	Indonesia (10)	Kemitraan	AFB/PPRC.30/19/Add.1	50,000
	Mexico (2)	IMTA	AFB/PPRC.30/21/Add.1	40,000
	Mexico (3)	IMTA	AFB/PPRC.30/22/Add.1	30,000
	Niger	BAGRI	AFB/PPRC.30/23/Add.1	49,000
	Tuvalu	MoF	AFB/PPRC.30/25/Add.1	50,000
<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>669,000</b>
<b>6. Project Formulation Grants (PFG): Regional Concepts</b>	<b>Region/Countries</b>	<b>IE</b>	<b>PPRC Document number</b>	<b>Grant Size, USD</b>
<b>RIE</b>				
	Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal	OSS	AFB/PPRC.30/37/Add.1	80,000
<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>80,000</b>
<b>8. Project Formulation Grants (PFG) Pre-concepts: Regional</b>	<b>Region/Countries</b>	<b>IE</b>	<b>PPRC Document number</b>	<b>Grant Size, USD</b>
<b>MIE</b>				
	Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu	WMO	AFB/PPRC.30/38/Add.1	20,000
<b>Sub-total, USD</b>				<b>20,000</b>

## ANNEX

**Table: Approved Regional Projects and Programmes**

Project Number	Project Title	Country	IE	Project Status	Approved Amount in USD	Approval Date
AF0000077	Agricultural Climate Resilience Enhancement Initiative (ACREI)	Regional (Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda)	WMO	Under Implementation	6,800,000.00	17/3/17
AF0000081	Adapting to Climate Change in Lake Victoria Basin	Regional (Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, United Republic of, Uganda)	UNEP	Under Implementation	5,000,000.00	5/7/17
AF0000089	Building adaptive capacity through food and nutrition security and peacebuilding actions in vulnerable Afro and indigenous communities in the Colombia-Ecuador border area	Regional (Colombia, Ecuador)	UNWFP	Under Implementation	14,000,000.00	5/7/17
AF0000078	Promoting Climate-Smart Agriculture in West Africa	Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Niger, Togo)	BOAD	Under Implementation	14,000,000.00	16/7/18
AF0000080	Reducing climate vulnerability and flood risk in coastal urban and semi urban areas in cities in Latin America	Regional (Chile, Ecuador)	CAFVE	Under Implementation	13,910,400.00	16/7/18
AF0000083	Restoring marine ecosystem services by rehabilitating coral reefs to meet a changing climate future	Regional (Mauritius, Seychelles)	UNDP	Under Implementation	10,000,000.00	12/10/18
AF00000122	Integrating Flood and Drought Management and Early Warning for Climate Change Adaptation in the Volta Basin	Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, Togo)	WMO	Under Implementation	7,920,000.00	12/10/18
AF00000126	Integrated climate-resilient transboundary flood risk management in the Drin River basin in the Western Balkans	Regional (Albania, Macedonia, the former Yugoslav Republic of, Montenegro)	UNDP	Under Implementation	9,927,750.00	15/3/19
AF00000124	Enhancing adaptive capacity of Andean communities through climate services	Regional (Chile, Colombia, Peru)	WMO	Under Implementation	7,432,250.00	8/7/19
AF00000109	Building Urban Climate Resilience in South-eastern Africa	Regional (Comoros, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique)	UNHAB	Under Implementation	13,997,423.00	15/7/19
AF00000111	Integration of climate change adaptation measures in the concerted management of the WAP transboundary complex: ADAPT-WAP	Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger)	OSS	Under Implementation	11,536,200.00	15/7/19
AF00000118	Climate change adaptation in vulnerable coastal cities and ecosystems of the Uruguay River	Regional (Argentina, Uruguay)	CAFVE	Under Implementation	13,999,996.00	15/7/19
AF00000119	Strengthening drought resilience of small holder farmers and pastoralists in the IGAD region	Regional (Djibouti, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda)	OSS	Under Implementation	13,079,540.00	11/10/19
AF00000092	Reducing vulnerabilities of populations in the Central Asia region from glacier lake outburst floods in changing climate	Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan)	UNESCO	Under Implementation	6,500,000.00	15/10/20
AF00000166	Increasing the resilience of both displaced persons and host communities to climate change-related water challenges in Jordan and Lebanon	Regional (Jordan, Lebanon)	UNHAB	Under Implementation	13,973,509.00	11/3/21
AF00000205	Mekong EbA South: Enhancing Climate Resilience in the Greater Mekong Subregion through Ecosystem based Adaptation in the Context of South-South Cooperation	Regional (Thailand, Vietnam)	UNEP	Proposal Approved	7,000,000.00	11/3/21
AF00000188	Resilience building as climate change adaptation in drought-struck South-western African communities	Regional (Angola, Namibia)	OSS	Proposal Approved	11,941,038.00	26/7/21
AF00000190	Scaling-up Climate-resilient Rice Production in West Africa	Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo)	OSS	Proposal Approved	14,000,000.00	21/10/21
AF00000248	Strengthening Resilience to Climate and Covid-19 Shocks through Integrated Water Management on the Sudan – Chad Border Area (SCCIWM)	Chad, Sudan	FAO	Proposal Approved	14,000,000.00	2/5/22
AF00000281	Use of Nature-based Solutions to Increase Resilience to Extreme Climate Events in the Atlantic Region of Central America	Belize, Guatemala, Honduras	CABEI	Proposal Approved	13,248,121.00	29/7/22
AF00000091	Groundwater Resources in the Greater Mekong Subregion: Collaborative Management to Increase Climate Change Resilience	Cambodia, Lao (People's Democratic Republic), Thailand, Viet Nam	UNESCO	Proposal Approved	4,898,775.00	29/7/22
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>21 projects</b>			<b>227,165,002.00</b>	