



## ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/PPRC.35/40/Add.1  
19 March 2025

---

Adaptation Fund Board  
Project and Programme Review Committee  
Thirty fifth Meeting  
Bonn, Germany, 8-9 April 2025

Agenda Item 5r)

### **PROJECT FORMULATION GRANT FOR NAMIBIA**

## I. Background

1. The Board at its eleventh meeting discussed the document “Funding for Project Formulation Costs” (AFB/11/6) and agreed, in its Decision B.11/18, that:

- i. project formulation grants (PFG) should be given once a project concept has been approved
- ii. consideration should be given in terms of differentiating between NIEs and MIEs, since some NIEs might have financial difficulties in trying to formulate project or programme proposals;
- iii. a flat rate should be given for project formulation costs;
- iv. a list of eligible activities and items still needed to be prepared; v. the grant should be additional to the project cost; and
- v. the fate of funds if the final project document was rejected should be determined.

2. There was consensus that a three-tiered system should be considered for project formulation grants: endorse a project concept with a PFG amount, endorse a project concept without a PFG amount, or reject the project concept.

3. Following the discussion, the Board decided:

To request the secretariat to reformulate the document, to include a comparison of eligible activities provided by other funds for project formulation grants, to take into account guidance provided by the Board at the present meeting, and to submit the document to the Board at its twelfth meeting, through the EFC. The EFC should review and finalize the process and policy of the project formulation grant focusing, in particular, on: the issue of unspent project funds; the procedures followed by other funds in that regard; and the determination of a flat-rate.

4. A document was prepared by the secretariat in response to the above mandate and presented at the third EFC meeting, which made specific recommendations to the Board at its twelfth meeting. Having considered the recommendation of the Ethics and Finance Committee, the Board, in its Decision B.12/28, decided that:

- (a) Project Formulation Grants (PFGs) will only be made available for projects submitted through NIEs. The Board would continue reviewing the question of PFGs for projects submitted through MIEs and would solicit comments from members and alternate members by February 14, 2011; the views would be compiled by the secretariat for presentation to the Board at its March 2011 meeting;*
- (b) If a country required a project formulation grant, a request should be made at the same time as the submission of a project concept to the secretariat. The secretariat will review and forward it to the PPRC for a final recommendation to the Board. A PFG could only be awarded when a project concept was presented and endorsed;*
- (c) A PFG form, reproduced in Annex V, should be submitted;*

- (d) Only activities related to country costs would be eligible for PFG funding;*
- (e) A flat rate of up to US\$30,000 shall be provided, inclusive of the management fee, which cannot exceed 8.5 per cent of the grant amount. The flat fee would be reviewed by the Board at its thirteenth and all subsequent meetings;*
- (f) If the final project document is rejected, any unused funds shall be returned to the Adaptation Fund Trust Fund;*
- (g) Once a project/programme formulation grant is disbursed, a fully developed project document should come to the Board for approval within 12 months. No additional grants for project preparation can be received by a country until the fully developed project/programme document has been submitted to the Board; and*
- (h) The Trustee was instructed to remove the set-aside of US\$100,000 for project preparation that had been decided at the June 2010 meeting, as project preparation would be approved on a project-by-project basis.*

5. In its twenty-fourth meeting, the Board had initiated steps to launch a pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, not to exceed US\$ 30 million and had requested the secretariat to prepare for the consideration of the Board a proposal for such a pilot programme (Decision B.24/30). In its twenty-fifth meeting, the secretariat submitted such document and the Board 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; and*
- (d) Request the secretariat to continue discussions with the Climate Technology Center and Network (CTCN) towards operationalizing, during the implementation of the pilot programme on regional projects and programmes, the Synergy Option 2 on knowledge management proposed by CTCN and included in Annex III of the document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2.*

*(Decision B.25/28)*

6. The approved document AFB/B.25/6/Rev.2 contained provisions for the approval of project formulated grants for regional project and programme proposals, at different development stages, as follows:

*“It is proposed that the Board open a structured call for MIEs and RIEs to submit pre-concepts for regional projects and programmes. The optional pre-concepts would be very brief proposals of maximum 5 pages that would explain the proposed regional adaptation project/programme. The pre-concepts would be screened and technically reviewed by the*

*secretariat, and subsequently reviewed by the PPRC. Together with the pre-concept, the proponent could submit a Phase I PFG request, up to the maximum level of US\$ 20,000. While endorsing the pre-concept, the Board could also approve the Phase I PFG request. The endorsement of the pre-concept would not create an obligation for the Board for later funding. As the next step, the proponent would submit a concept, and with it the proponent could submit a Phase II PFG request. The maximum AFB/PPRC.18/25/Add.1 level of the Phase II PFG would be US\$ 80,000 for proposals that had been previously granted Phase I PFG, and US\$ 100,000 for proposals that bypassed the optional pre-concept stage. While endorsing the concept, the Board could also approve the Phase II PFG request. The endorsement of the concept would not create an obligation for the Board for later funding, as it is the case for the national projects. The final stage of the proposal process would be the submission of the fully-developed regional project document”.*

## **II. The Project Formulation Grant Request**

7. This addendum to the document AFB/PPRC.35/40 “Proposal for Namibia” includes a request for a Project Formulation Grant, requesting a budget of US\$ 150,000, which was received by the secretariat along with the concept for the AF00000426 “*Building Climate Resilient Health Systems*”. This proposal was submitted by World Health Organization (WHO), which is a Multilateral Implementing Entity of the Adaptation Fund, in time for consideration by the Adaptation Fund Board at its forty-fourth Board meeting.

8. In accordance with Decision B.12/28, paragraph (b), the secretariat carried out an initial review of the PFG request and found that the document provided detailed information on the use of the requested funds. The proposed activities were aligned with the goal of the project and would comprehensive consultation process; baseline assessment studies, and design of the full proposal.

9. Therefore, the PPRC may want to consider and recommend to the Board to approve the PFG Request, provided that the related concept proposal is endorsed.



**Revised PFG Submission Form<sup>1</sup> (additions in red)**

**Project Formulation Grant (PFG)**

**Submission Date:** 07 January 2025

**Adaptation Fund Project ID:**

**Country/ies:** Namibia

**Title of Project/Programme:** Building Climate Resilient Health Systems

**Type of IE (NIE/RIE/MIE):** Multilateral Implementing Entity (MIE)

**Implementing Entity:** WHO Namibia Country office

**Executing Entity/ies:** Ministry of Health and Social Services

**A. Project Preparation Timeframe**

<b>Start date of PFG</b>	Upon concept note approval
<b>Completion date of PFG</b>	8 months after concept note approval

**B. Proposed Project Preparation Activities (\$)**

<b>List of Proposed Project Preparation Activities</b>	<b>Output of the PFG Activities</b>	<b>US\$ Amount</b>	<b>Budget note<sup>2</sup></b>
Assessments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Knowledge attitude and Practice (KAP) studies will be conducted to provide baseline data, inform decision-making, tailor interventions, prioritize resource allocation, monitor and evaluate impact, and engage the community effectively.</li><li>2. Other baseline assessments will generate information that will inform refining of activities and setting targets</li></ol>	70,000	

<sup>1</sup> As presented in AFB/PPRC.33/40 Annex 1.

<sup>2</sup> The proposal should include a detailed budget with budget notes indicating the break- down of costs at the activity level. It should also include a budget on the Implementing Entity management fee use.

Gender Analysis	<p>Gender analysis will assess the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Governance and Management:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion of gender perspectives in leadership, decision-making and policy formulation.</li> <li>• Inclusion of women in governance structures at community level</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>2. Access to Resources and Services:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addressing gender-specific barriers to healthcare access.</li> <li>• Addressing gender-specific barriers to resources including economic opportunities</li> <li>• Ensuring water and sanitation needs are met for women.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>3. Impact of Climate Change on Health:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducting gender specific challenges.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>4. Monitoring and Evaluation:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring gender-sensitive data collection and analysis.</li> <li>• Mainstreaming gender consideration in routine monitoring processes of relevant sectors.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	20, 000	
Workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stakeholders' consultation workshop for all line ministries</li> <li>- Stakeholders' consultation workshop targeting regional councils, office of Governors and Regional local authorities</li> <li>- Stakeholder Consultations workshop targeting Community Members</li> <li>- Stakeholder Consultations workshop targeting women</li> </ul>	10,00 * 3 Consultations = 30,000	

Travel and Participation	All costs related to travel and technical support incurred by the Implementing Entity (IE	13,000	
Design of the full project proposal	A comprehensive document, including the technical outcomes of assessment studies, will be developed and validated before submission to the Adaptation Fund (AF).	12,000	
Other Costs	Management Fee	5,000	
<b>Total Project Formulation Grant</b>		150,000	

Please describe below each of the PFG activities and provide justifications for their need and for the amount of funding required:

#### **Justification**

##### **1. Assessments (US\$ 70,000)**

#### **Description:**

- **Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP) Studies:** These studies aim to gather baseline data on community perceptions, practices, and knowledge related to the project's thematic areas.
- **Other Baseline Assessments:** These assessments will generate specific data in the targeted regions to assess the status of implementation against all programme strategies, and selected indicators to guide refinement of activities and setting of targets.

#### **Justification:**

- The KAP studies will ensure that project activities are evidence-based and tailored to address real, contextual needs. For example, understanding gaps in awareness or misconceptions can inform targeted educational campaigns.
- Other baseline assessments are critical to provide an objective reference for measuring progress and project impact over time. This data will also guide the prioritization of interventions to optimize resource allocation and increase efficiency.

By anchoring project activities in robust data, these assessments enhance project accountability and contribute to achieving measurable, sustainable outcomes.

##### **2. Gender Analysis (US\$ 20,000)**

#### **Description:**

- This activity focuses on evaluating gender dynamics and inequalities across governance, resource access, and climate resilience. The review will focus on the following aspects;

**Governance and Management:** Will assess the extent to which women participation is ensured in decision-making and policy formulation and leadership roles.

**Access to Resources and Services:** Addressing gender-specific barriers to healthcare access and ensuring water and sanitation needs are met for women

**Impact of Climate Change on Health:** Gender-sensitive vulnerability is considered in various climate change related assessments. This will inform the development of equitable adaptation strategies.

**Monitoring and Evaluation:** Ensuring gender-disaggregated data collection and the use of gender-specific indicators for progress tracking.

Justification:

- Gender analysis is essential to address structural inequalities that disproportionately affect women and other marginalized groups, ensuring that interventions do not inadvertently perpetuate discrimination.
- Evaluate gender-specific barriers and inequalities in accessing essential services, such as healthcare, education, water, and sanitation, while identifying opportunities for promoting equitable access for all.
- Incorporating gender-sensitive approaches strengthens the project's alignment with global commitments, such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 5 (Gender Equality).

### **3. Workshops (US\$ 30,000)**

**Description:**

**Stakeholder Consultation Workshops:**

- Workshops for line ministries to ensure intersectoral collaboration and alignment with national priorities.
- Workshops with regional councils, Governors' offices, and local authorities to localize project interventions and gather on-the-ground insights.
- Community-level consultations to ensure that the voices and concerns of local populations are integrated into project planning.

**Justification:**

- Stakeholder engagement promotes ownership, accountability, and sustainability of project outcomes. Engaging line ministries ensures that the project aligns with existing policies and avoids duplication of efforts.
- Regional and local consultations provide an opportunity to address specific challenges unique to different contexts, promoting tailored interventions.
- Community consultations help incorporate indigenous knowledge and practices, building trust and ensuring cultural relevance, which increases the likelihood of success and community buy-in.

### **4. Travel and Participation (US\$ 13,000)**

**Description:**

This budget covers travel expenses for the Implementing Entity (IE) staff to provide technical support, participate in stakeholder engagements, and oversee field activities.



**Justification:**

- Field visits are crucial to ground-truth data collected during assessments and ensure that proposed interventions are contextually appropriate.
- Travel for technical support ensures high-quality outputs, adherence to Adaptation Fund guidelines, and the effective facilitation of PFG activities.
- Direct engagement with stakeholders at various levels fosters collaboration and builds trust, which is vital for long-term project success.

**5. Design of the Full Project Proposal (US\$ 10,000)****Description:**

A comprehensive project proposal will be developed, incorporating technical outcomes from assessments, stakeholder inputs, and validated recommendations.

**Justification:**

- A well-designed project proposal is essential to secure funding and effectively communicate the project's vision, objectives, and implementation strategy.
- By integrating assessment findings and stakeholder feedback, the proposal ensures alignment with community needs, national priorities, and donor requirements.
- Validation by stakeholders enhances credibility and commitment, ensuring that the proposal reflects a collective vision and has buy-in from all relevant parties.

**6. Other Costs: Management Fee (US\$ 8,000)****Description:**

This fee covers operational and administrative costs, including project coordination, reporting, and compliance with financial and administrative requirements.


**Justification:**

- Proper management and coordination are critical for the seamless execution of PFG activities.
- These costs ensure timely reporting, effective resource utilization, and compliance with donor requirements.
- By covering these essential operational needs, the project team can focus on delivering high-quality outcomes without administrative disruptions

**Implementing Entity**

This request has been prepared in accordance with the Adaptation Fund Board's procedures and meets the Adaptation Fund's criteria for project identification and formulation

Implementing Entity Coordinator, IE Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
---	-----------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------	------------------

<p>Dr. Richard Banda, WHO Country Representative, Namibia  World Health Organisation  UN House, 2nd Floor 38 Stein Street Klein Windhoek  PO Box 3444 Windhoek Namibia  Tel: +26461255121  Mobile: +264811501733  Email: <a href="mailto:bandar@who.int">bandar@who.int</a></p>		01/07/2025	Dr. Juliet Nabyonga	+26461255121	nabyongaj@who.int
---	---	------------	---------------------	--------------	-------------------



REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA

## MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FORESTRY AND TOURISM

Tel: (00 264) 61 284 2111  
Fax: (00 264) 61 232 057

Cnr Robert Mugabe &  
Dr Kenneth Kaunda Street  
Private Bag 13306  
Windhoek  
Namibia

03/10/2024

To: The Adaptation Fund Board  
c/o Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat  
Email: [Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org](mailto:Secretariat@Adaptation-Fund.org)  
Fax: 202 522 3240/5

Subject: **Endorsement for Building Climate Resilient Health Systems in Namibia**

In my capacity as designated authority for the Adaptation Fund in Namibia, I confirm that the above national project proposal is in accordance with the government's national priorities in implementing adaptation activities to reduce adverse impacts of, and risks, posed by climate change in the country.

Accordingly, I am pleased to endorse the above project proposal with support from the Adaptation Fund. If approved, the project/programme will be implemented by the World Health Organization and executed by Ministry of Health and Social Services, Namibia.

Sincerely,

  
Teofilus Nghitila  
Executive Director,  
Ministry of Environment Forestry and Tourism,



**“Stop the poaching of our rhinos”**

All official correspondence must be addressed to the Executive Director

